Doctrine and Defense.

Theological and ecclesiastical contemporary history

Monthly Bulletin.

Published

from the

Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, et al. St.

Edited by

St. Louis Seminary faculty.

Luther: "A preacher must not only feed, so that he instructs the sheep how they should be true Christians, but also ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false teaching and introduce error, as the devil does not rest. Now many people can be found who are willing that the gospel should be preached, if only one does not cry out against the wolves and preach against the prelates. But though I preach rightly, and feed and teach the sheep well, yet it is not enough to keep the sheep, and to keep them, lest the wolves come and lead them away again. For what is it built, if I cast up stones, and I see another cast them in again? The wolf may well suffer the sheep to have good pasture; he loveth them the better that they find feist; but this he cannot suffer, that the dogs bark in hostility."

Seventieth Volume.

St. Louis, Mo.
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1924 .

Content.

January. Page

The Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach. 1
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 27

February.

From the history of English hymnody. 33
Literature 49
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 55

March.

On the Evaluation of the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach. 65
Literature ....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History ....

April.

97
Literature ....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History ....

May.

129
Literature ....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History ....

June.

161
Literature ....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History ....

July.

193

Literature ....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History ....

Page

July.

Miscellany .....
Literature .....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History .....
.....

August.

Miscellany .....
Literature .....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History .....

September.

Miscellany .....
Literature .....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History .....

October.

Miscellany .....
Literature .....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History .....

November.

Miscellany .....
Literature .....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History .....

December.

Literature .....
Ecclesiastical and Contemporary History .....

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. **January 1924.** **No. 1.**

The Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach.

The Lutheran World Convention, which met in the Lutheran city of Eisenach at the foot of Wartburg Castle from August 19 to 25, 1923, has been all but ignored by the American daily press. "The daily press has had but little to say about it," remarked the *Lutheran Survey* of October. Our sectarian papers, too, have made little essence of the same. The tediously slow report of the "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung," spread over numerous numbers, but otherwise excellent in objectivity, which did not come to an end until December, has not helped to raise interest in it, to leave a clear picture of it, and to strengthen the impression of its possible importance. Nevertheless, the meeting in the Wartburg city is without doubt one of the most important and perhaps most momentous ecclesiastical events of the past year - momentous especially for the Lutheran Church in America, which it may outwardly make more prominent, but inwardly it may flatten and make it accessible to indifferentism to an even greater degree than before.

The plan of uniting all Lutherans in the world is not new. Already before the year 1850 Löhe had similar thoughts. Hochstetter writes: "Pastor Löhe, as the 'Kirchliche Mitteilungen' show, not only had in mind the gathering of the individual German co-religionists scattered in North America, but his goal was also to see all Lutherans in America, in Australia, and in general in the whole world united in one church body". (Gesch. d. Missourisynode, p. 179.) Among the people who since then have been interested before others in a Lutheran World Federation was Church Councilor D. Resch. His plan was to transform the General Lutheran Conference, founded in 1868, into a world conference of Lutheranism. In the years 1900 to 1907, as the "Kirchliche Zeitschrift" notes, he "tirelessly promoted this idea with much fire and noble enthusiasm in briefs and essays.

represent." (641.) But when in 1907 the Vereinslutherans were admitted from the Prussian Union into the executive, the so-called Narrower Conference of the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference, he left the same with his comrades-in-arms and founded the Lutheran Federation. His plan, however, has now found some realization in the World Convention at Eisenach. "Before the war," said Söderblom at Eisenach, "it looked as if the Mgemeine Ev.-Luth. conference would grow into a full representation of Lutheranism." Not only Lutherans from Europe (from Germany, the Baltic provinces, Russia, Norway, Sweden, etc.), but also the General Council and the General Synod in America were connected with it. Thus the Lutheran World Convention can be seen as the rejuvenated, enlarged General Lutheran Conference, which held its last meeting in Upsala in 1911. 1)

D. Morehead was probably the first to give impetus after the World War to a gathering of representatives of possibly all Lutherans in the world. "In Germany," said Prof. Jacobs at Philadelphia Seminary Day, "they look upon the World Convention as one of the fruits of Morehead's labors." In his many travels in the interests of the Relief Society operated by the National Lutheran Council, at the head of which he stood, it impressed itself upon him everywhere and again and again how disadvantageous, especially in these oppressive, fermenting, and all-transforming times after the war, was the existing isolation of the Lutheran churches, and what advantages it would have for Lutheranism if the Lutherans in the world could somehow form a connection which would make them outwardly capable of action as a world power. In Germany, too, Morehead had instituted a relief committee to distribute the gifts of love, which afforded him an opportunity to discuss the plan of a world convention with the leaders of Lutheranism there and with previous promoters (promoters) of larger Lutheran associations. Since then the idea moved officials of the National Lutheran Council, the General Ev. Lutheran Conference, and the Lutheran Federation. The plan was presented to the

1) Before the conference held in Leipzig on June 15 of last year, D. Laible said: "It is true that the General Lutheran Conference had long since attempted to establish international relations and connections between the Lutherans. But no real progress was made. The inhibitions became even greater when during the World War everything was torn apart that had Lutheran connections with one another. Alienation arose and enmity. With 'world peace' came a transformation. God awakened the participation of Lutherans all over the world for the need of fellow believers in Europe, and out of the participation grew love and many a valuable personal connection. Was it not also true here: "What God has joined together, let not man put asunder"? Here the thought of the Lutheran World Convention began. The Lutheran world no longer wants to give away the unity it has found."

presented to the executive of the National Lutheran Council meeting in New York in December 1919. As a result, Morehead and Larsen contacted officials of the General Lutheran Conference and the Lutheran Federation. A joint committee was formed from the representatives of the Lutheran Conference and the National Lutheran Council, with which the representatives of the Lutheran Federation were in advisory relationship. The Americans submitted a plan which was finally accepted with change even by the Germans, who were hesitant at first, especially when it was decided to hold the meeting only in 1923, in Eisenach, instead of already in 1922 in Switzerland (Geneva) or in Holland (The Hague) or in one of the Scandinavian countries, as the Americans had originally wanted.2) The negotiations took place in the Mission House in Leipzig. "The cradle of the Lutheran World Convention stood in the Leipzig Mission House," remarks Paul, Director of the Mission.

In keeping with this history, invitations were issued in the summer of 1922 on behalf of the General Lutheran Conference and the National Lutheran Council. For America, the latter took over the task of inviting Lutheran synods to elect delegates. Representation from Europe and the other countries was provided by the Lutheran Conference, but not in the way it was done in America. In order to secure as much as possible the Lutheran character of the World Convention and to exclude as much as possible liberal-minded theologians, it was not left to the national churches to choose the representatives themselves, but the officials of the Lutheran Conference took care of the selection and invitation. This was also in keeping with the customary manner in the national churches of electing representatives to international assemblies. Mission Director Paul, whom the "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" calls "the soul of the German preparatory committee" (consisting of Paul, Ihmels, and Laible), did much laborious, self-sacrificing work.

From the beginning it was not planned to have a large mass meeting, but only a gathering of selected representatives. Laible wrote in the "Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" of 15 June 1923:

2) D. Reu writes: "The desire to really meet once with representatives of the whole Lutheran Church of the world; the longing, in this difficult time of division and fracture, to be allowed to see something of the ecumenicity of the Lutheran Church, which transcends all linguistic and national boundaries and barriers, and to feel something of the truth of the 'una sancta'; the need to be strengthened by mutual faith at a time when all outward glory has fallen away; gratitude for the help often experienced - all this probably finally determined them to yield to the friendly urging of the American representatives and to decide to organize a Lutheran World Convention." (K. Z., 644.)

"The character and functions of the Convention require that the work be done in closed meetings rather than before the general public. Therefore, only invited representatives will be allowed to attend. The duty of those not invited will be to intercede that the Lord may give success and prosperity to the work." (Sp. 377.) The number of representatives assigned to each body was governed by the relative size of the same. The Convention was to give a true reflection of the numerical spread of the Lutheran Church around the globe: about 80 from Germany, 40 from North America, 13 from Sweden, 7 each from Norway, Russia, and Finland, 6 from Denmark, 4 each from Poland and Czechoslovakia, 3 from Estonia, 2 each from Latvia, Austria, Rumania, Hungary, France, India, one each from Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Holland, South Africa, Brazil, Australia. When the list of names was read out in Eisenach, 151 delegates from 22 countries responded. Since it was decided at the last hour to issue "audience tickets" to those who had been recommended by confidential advisers, it was estimated by some that around 250 people were present at any one time. In his welcoming address D. Ihmels said: "Representatives have come today from almost all the Lutheran church communities of the world. Our hearts grow wide, they are full of silent worship." (A. E. L. K., Sp. 576.)3)

Present from the United Lutheran Church were D. Morehead, D. Benze, D. Knubel, D. C. M. Jacobs, D. Voigt, D. Wentz, D. Neve, D. Hoffmann, D. Frey, Bank Director D. Miller, and P. Coleman (United Lutheran Church missionary to India, who was also admitted as a delegate); from the Augustana Synod, D. Brandelle and D. Sebelius; from the United Norwegian Church, D. Stub; from the Ohio Synod, D. Hein and D. von Fisher; from the Iowa Synod, D. Reu, who, being in Germany, was elected official representative by the Iowa Synod at its meeting from August 16 to 21 (a time which partly coincided with that of the World Convention), and therefore did not attend the Convention as a delegate until Wednesday. 4)

3) In our statements we mainly follow the reports of Laible in the "A. E. L. K.", Melhorns in the *News Builetin of* the National Lutheran Council, Melhorns in *Pastor's Monthly,* Heins in *Pastor's Monthly,* Anthes' in "Luthe
rischen Zeitblatt" and Rens in the "Kirchliche Zeitschrift".

4) The desire to see the Iowa Synod represented at the World Convention was great in Germany. After all, it is still in the closest connection with Neuendettelsau, the Lutheran Federation and the Lutheran God's Box, whose previous support of the Synod of Santa Catharina, Parana and others in Brazil has now been taken over by the Iowa Synod. Particular joy in participating in the World Convention, however, does not seem to have been present, at least at first, in the Iowa Synod. The joy was all the greater when their representatives did appear in Eisenach. Laible says in his report: "The Bor-

Of the influence of the Americans, a letter from Melhorn in the *News Bulletin of* the National Lutheran Council, September 20, says: "They were everywhere and in every way given an opportunity to express their views. They served on the most important committees and were recognized as more than sources of wealth." D. Knubel also coveted bent Philadelphia Seminary Day: "The influence of the American Lutheran Church was described as of outstanding importance, not simply because of our gifts, but because of cur initiative and the fresh and new experience which the Church in this land was able to bring to the Church in the Old World." D. Wentz, in the *Lutheran Quarterly, says:* "The American delegates numbered seventeen, but because of their initiative and enterprise they exercised an influence out of all proportion to their number." (410.)

This influence came primarily from the delegates of the United Lutheran Church. D. Reu writes in the "Kirchliche Zeitschrift": "Since the special representative of the National Council, D. Morehead, -belongs to the United Lutheran Church; since the same is true of the second representative of the same (Prof. D. Benze); since the chairman of the American preparatory committee (Prof. D. C. Jacobs) is a member of this church; since, according to its number of members, eight delegates rightfully belonged to it, and among them the already mentioned one, Prof. D. C. Jacobs, belongs to the United Lutheran Church. Jacobs) is a member of that church; since eight delegates were lawfully allotted to it, according to its number of members, and among them was the aforementioned Prof. D. Jacobs, distinguished by his sagacity as well as his purposeful action; since the principal representative of the Augustana Synod is known for his pronounced inclination toward the United Lutheran Church; and since he is a member of the United Lutheran Church.

Chairman Ihmels opened it [the second closed meeting on Wednesday] with the reading of 1 Tim. 1, 12 ff. and prayer and announced that the Iowa Synod had now also sent its representatives, namely Pros. D. Reu from Dubuque and P. Möhl from Thomasboro; he greeted the two who had appeared. A joyful "Ah!" went through the hall at this news. So, after all! The Iowa Synod had thought long and hard about whether they wanted to attend. They would have been sorely missed, this Synod of pronounced, decided Lutheranism, whose beginnings go back to Löhe,' which after the war in a hidden way exercised an extensive activity of love for the German brethren, of which the newspapers reported but little, but the books of God became all the fuller. One would have especially missed D. Reu, the understanding commissioner of his synod, the quiet benefactor at universities and institutions, at Lutheran papers, at individual pastors, etc. Now he had come after all, and the Iowa Synod was seated in the World Convention. This was the joy that moved many." (652 f.) That D. Reu attended the World Convention, as he states in the "Kirchliche Zeitschrift," was because "1. that a representation of Iowa was urgently desired by the delegates present from the Ohio Synod, as well as from the United Norwegian Church, as well as from members of the Lutheran Federation and the Narrow Conference; 2. That the character of the World Convention as a free conference has been repeatedly emphasized; 3. That an opportunity has been afforded to testify that standing entirely on the unabridged confession of the Lutheran Church in no way renders it unfit for the work of the church in the present day." (649.)

and since the Norwegians were represented by only one instead of two representatives, the United Lutheran Church had an immensely strong preponderance from the outset. This was clearly apparent to the attentive observer in Eisenach." (645.) But according to some accounts (especially from the circles of the Lutheran Federation), the influence of the other American delegates was no small one.

As far as the German representation was concerned, it was made up of church regents, university professors and representatives of missions, diaconal houses, etc. From Bavaria there were: Church President D. Veit, Baron von Pechmann, Prof. D. Bachmann and Grützmacher from Erlangen, Seminary Director D. Meiser, Diakoniffenhäusdirektor Liv. Lauerer and Director of Missions D. Ruf from Neuendettelsau. From Hanover: General Superintendent D. Hoppe, Konsistorialrat D. Wagemann, Superintendents D. Stisser and D. Schaaf, Prof. D. Stange from Göttingen, P. Eißfeldt, Justizrat Haccius, Diakoniffenhausrektor He. Lohmann, Count von Wedel, Director of Missions D. Haccius from Hermannsburg. From Saxony: Bishop D. Ihmels, Konsistorialpräsident D. Böhme, Oberkirchenräte D. Cordes and D. Jentzsch, Church Councillor Kaiser, Prof. D. Girgensohn from Leipzig, Editor D. Laible, Prof. D. Amelung from Dresden, Pastors Lohoff, Hübener and Gerber, P. D. Ahner and Excellency D. Stieglitz as representatives of the Lutheran God's Boxes, Count Vitztum, merchant Steinbach, Mission Director D. Paul from Leipzig, Director of the Jewish Mission D. von Harling from Leipzig, Director of the Mgemeinen Ev.Luth. Schulverein D. Kropatscheck, Reichswart of the German Youth Movement Lic. Stange from Leipzig, Museum Director D. Schramm. From Mecklenburg: Prof. D. Walther, the bishops D. Behm and D. Tolzien, Oberkirchenrat D. Haak, P. Studemund. Also present was the aged D. Bard, but not as a representative. From Oldenburg: President of the High Church Council D. Tielemann. From Schleswig-Holstein: General Superintendent D. Mordhorst from Kiel, the exponent of the "modern theology of the old faith" and former General Superintendent D. Th. Kaftan (who at present serves the Free Church congregation in Baden-Baden), Pastors Thun and Stalmann, Inspector Bracker from Breklum, Seminary Director Rohnert from Kropp. From Hamburg: Director of the Emigrant Mission Hardeland, Pastors Lehfeldt, Reme and Reimers, the industrialist Max von Schinkel. From Schaumburg-Lippe: Konsistorialrat Türnau. From Reuß ä. L.: Oberkirchenrat D. Jahn. From Württemberg: Konsistorialpräsident D. Zeller, Prälat D. Traub from Stuttgart, Stadtpfarrer Rom er, Dekan Gauger, Pfarrer Gußmann. From the Uniate Hesse the Union Lutherans: General Superintendent D. Dettmering from Kassel, Superintendent D. Landau, the Deaconess House Rectors Hickel at Darmstadt and Petrenz at Frankfurt a. M., Pastor Wagner. From Prussia the Union Lutherans:

Prof. D. Haußleiter and Prof. D. Kunze and Prof. D. Schultze from Greifswald, General Superintendent D. Zöllner, the Superintendents D. Matthes, D. Pfannschmidt, D. Kögel and D. Klingender, the Misfionsdirektoren D. Kausch and D. Knak from Berlin, Count Seidlitz. The church councillor of the Breslau Free Church D. Nagel from Breslau was (together with Superintendent Anthes) the representative of the Free Churches. The Thuringian large church was represented by: General Superintendent D. Braune from Rudolstadt, Church Councilor D. Auerbach from Gera, Baron von Rotenhan, and Collegiate Preacher D. Otto from Eisenach, who arranged quarters for the guests in private houses, among them, as D. Laible notes, many sreie, despite the hardship of the times. (Cf. K. Z., p. 646 ff.).

"Thus," remarks Reu, "all shades of Lutheranism in Germany were represented; the only thing missing on the right was the Saxon Free Church, which was connected with Missouri." The right was represented: the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Free Churches in Germany and the Lutheran Federation (by Anthes, Amelung, Nagel, Gußmann, Haccius, Ruf, Kropatscheck, and others). Nor was the other extreme absent: twelve representatives of the Lutherans in the Prussian Union, five representatives of the Lutherans from the Hessian Union, and four from the now almost osficially liberal and united Thuringian Great Church. The middle party includes the bishops, superintendents and theologians of the regional churches, all of whom, even if not yet infected by liberalism themselves, are in church fellowship with the liberals and radicals of their regional churches.

Of the European representatives outside Germany, from Estonia: Kukk, Lattik, Mühlen, Walter; from Latvia: Irbe and Pölchau; from Lithuania: Tittelbach; from Russia: Meyer; from Poland: Bursche, Angerstein, Diedrich, Zöckler; from Romania: Walbaum; from Yugoslavia: Wagner; from Czechoslovakia: Janoska, Zoch, Wehrenpfennig, Lanyi, Schmidt; from Hungary: Raffey, Pröhle, Kaas; from Austria: Haase and Saul; from Holland: Westermann; from France: Bach from Paris and Stricker from Stratzburg; from Denmark: Ludwigs, Holt, Jörgensen; from Norway: Normann and Thvedt; from Sweden: Söderblom, Danell, Lindberg, Brundin, Pehrsson; from Finland: Aarmisalo, Gummerus, Kaila, Loimaranta, Pfaler, Roos, and the missionary in China Sihvonen.

Most of these names, apart from what we read about them in the reports from Eisenach, are as good as unknown quantities to us. We assume that the majority of them are positively minded, at any rate not decidedly liberal. Admittedly, as "Lehre und Wehre" has had to note repeatedly, even the Nordic countries and faculties (Helsingfors included) have not been free of liberalism for a long time. Closest to us Missourians is Superintendent Angerstein of Lodz, whom we had the opportunity to meet personally many years ago in St. Louis. There-

Söderblom's extremely liberal and unionist position is world-famous, at least also known to the Scandinavians. Nevertheless, at Eisenach also from the Nordic delegates nobody seems to have questioned the Lutheranism of the same. It may be less known that Bishop Danell in 1921 not only saddled the Leipzig Tamulen Church with a bishop, but also celebrated communion with the Anglicans on that occasion. Did he mention the latter in his report on the work of the Swedish Lutherans in the Leipzig Tamul Mission? Reu rightly remarks: "If the distance between the individual representatives of Germany was already great, it was still greater among the representatives of foreign countries; there was also a decided right, such as Superintendent Angerstein, but also a left up to Söderbloml" (648.) At the Convention, however, Söderblom seems to have stood out little. The "Alsatian Lutheran" reports from the "Messenger of Peace": "Mostly he was invisible. Neither did he preach a sermon nor give a lecture. Only once [at Monday's public meeting] did he say things that did not sound at all modernist."

With reference to all the representatives who appeared in Eisenach, D. Laible writes in the "A. E. L. K.": "There they stood, the Lutheran bishops and church presidents from Germany and America, from Scandinavia and Austria, from Czechia and Poland, from Estonia and Latvia, representatives from Russia, France, Holland, etc., and in addition a number of Lutheran professors of theology, Lutheran mission and diaconal directors, and many others, ...a number of Lutheran theological professors, Lutheran directors of missions and diaconia... ...and many others, all leaders in the service of the Lutheran church... It was a brief, yet memorable moment when, at the first closed meeting, the individual names were read and the person called rose from his seat. You got to know them, the many-named, on whom the burden of responsibility rests, who are in the front line today."

As the names listed show, it was primarily higher church officials who made up the convention: bishops, superintendents, prelates, professors, directors, etc. This prompts D. Hein to remark: "I regret that only the leaders and highest officials were present at this convention. There were comparatively few of the rank and file of the ministry. I believe that in a conference of pastors and representative laymen much more could have been accomplished to strengthen and assist the Lutheran forces in their struggles." Certainly, we too do not expect the salvation of the Church, especially in Germany, primarily from the higher officials. But what an immense crowd would have had to be brought together in Eisenach, if "the rank and file of the ministry," together with the laity, were to have been represented there, even quite scantily! A world

Convent, if it is not to degenerate into a mere demonstration, only makes sense if it is composed primarily of officials who represent their respective synods and not merely their own congregations.

As soon as the Convention was announced for the period from August 19 to 24, it was greeted with joy in most Lutheran journals and made the subject of discussion. In America, even the secular press sought to interest itself in the same, admittedly, as already mentioned, with but little success. In Germany, in spite of some fluctuations, one did not lose courage and desire for the Convention even when the economic conditions there became more and more dismal, the French torments more and more unbearable, and the political situation more and more precarious both inwardly and outwardly. "One was in doubt," writes the "A. E. L. K.," "whether the Convention could come about in view of the growing political and economic difficulties. There was no lack of voices earnestly advising adjournment; others wanted to dare with God. Those who dared were right." Among those who sought to strengthen interest in the Convention in Germany was D. Laible. At the conference held in Leipzig on June 15, 1923, for example, he enthusiastically described the approaching Convention as "the hour of God which suddenly makes the world unity of the Lutheran Church appear. Without organization, without human agreement, the Lutherans have found each other. . . . The Lutheran world no longer wants to give away the unity it has found."

In order to put the representatives hurrying to Eisenach and their constituents in the right serious mood, the "A. E. L. K." published a festive number shortly before the Convention convened, with excellent words by Luther, short articles on topics suggested by the Convention, and thirteen old illustrations, plus on the front a large picture of Christ on the cross, in front of it Luther as preacher and interpreter of the same. And as all Lutherans in the world had been repeatedly encouraged to unite in prayer and intercession for the success of the Convention, so also this festive number closed with an "Invitation to Intercession for the World Convention of Lutheranism" signed by Bishop Ihmels, the first president of the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference. 5)

5) Ihmels' request reads as follows: "This festive number shall not go out without our last once more laying to the heart of our friends the intercession for the World Convention of Lutheranism to meet in Eisenach on August 19. As the figure of the Lord greets us on the first sheet, so the last should be that we let ourselves be led by Him into prayer for His blessing on the forthcoming meeting. Let us hold before our Lord how he himself prayed on his last night for the unity of his own, and let us, trusting in this, call upon him to be gracious to us.

In its issue of June 29, 1923 (and again of July 27) the "A. E.L. K." printed the program set for the World Convention. According to it, Sunday, August 19, in the evening at 6 o'clock, there was to be an opening service in St. George's Church with a sermon by D. Stub; 8-1/2 o'clock an informal gathering of the Convention participants. For Monday, August 20, in the morning 8-1/2 o'clock, morning devotion by Father Otto, for the representatives only; in the morning 10 o'clock large public meeting in the hall of the "Fürstenhof" with lecture by V.Morehead on "Mutual Support of the Churches"; in the afternoon 4 o'clock celebration at the Wartburg with speeches by D. Ihmels and D. Jacobs; in the evening 8 o'clock lecture by D. Elert on "The Inner Future of Lutheranism." For Tuesday, August 21, in the morning 8 o'clock, public service with sermon by Bishop von Raffey of Budapest; at 10 o'clock the first closed meeting of the deputies in the hall of the "Erholung," with lecture by D. Ihmels on the "Ecumenical Character of Lutheranism"; in the evening 8 o'clock free discussion by the members of the Convention on the ecclesiastical life of their countries. For Wednesday, August 22, in the morning 8 o'clock, liturgical devotion for the representatives only; at 10 o'clock the second closed meeting with lecture by D. Jörgensen of Copenhagen on "The Confession as the Indispensable Foundation of the Lutheran Church"; in the afternoon 5 o'clock opportunity for conferences for Inner Mission and for school questions; in the evening 8^ o'clock deliberations on the Lutheran press. For Thursday, August 23, in the morning 8 o'clock, public service with sermon by Bishop Jrbe of Riga; at 10 o'clock the third closed meeting with lecture by D. Knubel on the subject: "That they may all be one - what can the Lutheran Church do for this?" In the evening 6 o'clock fourth closed meeting with lectures by D. Paul from Leipzig and D. Benze from Philadelphia. For Friday, August 24, morning 8^ o'clock, fifth closed meeting with papers on "The Lutheran World Diaspora" by D. Ahner of Leipzig, D. Hein of Columbus, and D. Pehrsson of Gothenburg; afternoon 6 o'clock closing public service with sermon by Prelate Traub of Stuttgart; evening 8-1/2 o'clock public farewell meeting with addresses by deputies of the Convention. For Saturday: Committee meetings.

to the days of Eisenach. Without him we can and want nothing; but he has power over the hearts and wants to redeem his promises, if we only believe. In particular, we ask the pastors to remember the Eisenach Conference with their congregations in prayer during the service on August 19. The more generally this happens, the more the unity of the confessing church, which bears Luther's name, will be expressed. But we want to continue in intercession and accompany all the days of the conference with our prayers. Let the conclusion be like the beginning [the first article of the festive number bears the heading: "Our Lord Christ"]: 'JEsus Christ yesterday and today, and the same forever.'"

The announcement of the above agenda concluded with a request to all Friends "to take the matter into their prayers. If the Convention is not prepared with prayer, all that men do is in vain. If there is a prayerful congregation behind the Convention, it will become a meeting before God, and God can bless it that it may be endued with power from on high to build His kingdom on earth." It was also announced that during the Convention an exhibition of the Bible would be held in the "Fürstenhof"; that before and after the Convention there would be a good opportunity to visit the Luther sites in Wittenberg and Erfurt; that the "Volkskirchliche Vereinigung der Christusgläubigen in Thüringen" (People's Church Association of the Faithful in Christ in Thuringia) would hold a public meeting on Sunday, August 19, in the evening at 8 o'clock, in the hall of the "Erholung" (Recreation), with a lecture by D. Laible from Leipzig. 6)

6) In connection with the World Convention, a crowd of Lutheran women had also gathered in Eisenach. *Lutheran 'Woman's Work* Brings on two reports, one by Mrs. D. Fry, the other by Mrs. D. Benze. The first says: "The Lutheran, women met in the same building in which the Lutheran World Convention assembled, and at the same time. The room was adjacent to the hall of the convention, separated only by a plaster wall, so that, when the women joined in singing, the strains could be heard by the leaders who formed the larger group." Two meetings were held, with Mrs. D. Cordes of St. Thomas Church, Leipzig, presiding, "Associated with her," the report continues, "were women of diverse nationalities; from France and Finland, from Russia and Amerina, from the new countries created after the war, as well as from many sections of Germany, they were drawn by a united impulse and endeavor.'" As on the Day of Pentecost, they were all with one accord in one place. For the first time in the history of the Lutheran Church such a cosmopolitan company of women had been brought together. One was a member of the German Parliament, another was Madame Henri Bach. It was an impressive object-lesson of church unity to see French and German side by side. Here was the wife of the bishop of Hungary. Close to her was the wife of the district superintendent of our Russian Relief Work, who had come from Moscow. The delegation from the United States included Mrs. H. G. Stub, of Minneapolis; Miss Caroline Voigt, of Columbia, S. C.; Mrs. A. R. Wentz, of Gettysburg; Mrs. Albert Benze and Mrs. A. L. Berman, of Toledo; Mrs. C. T. Benze, of Mount Airy; Mrs. Spindler, of Baltimore; Mrs. Poens- gen, of Jersey City, and the writer" (Mrs. Fry). Mrs. D. Benze tells of a stranger who happened to attend the closing service Friday at St. George's Church. "The next morning," it continues, "he appeared at the desk of the sister who was in charge of the Information Bureau and begged for every bit of literature she could give him on the subject, the various press notices and the programs, and he told her that in all his life nothing had ever made such an impression on him. If that is how the convention appealed to one who was not interested beforehand, can you imagine what it meant to those who had prayed over it, and to whom it meant the dawning of a new day, when the Lutherans of the world should be one in heart and purpose?"

The Convention went exactly as planned. It began on Sunday with the opening of the Bible exhibition, with Bishop Ihmels and D. Paul giving the addresses. "Luther and the Bible," they said very beautifully, "belong together, and that is why the Lutheran World Convention and the Bible exhibition also belong together. "7) The exhibition comprised two parts: 1. "The Illustration of the Bible in Luther's Lifetime," led by D. Schramm; 2. "The Distribution of the Bible as a Book of Humanity," led by D. Gerber. Picture Bibles of old and new times, scientific Bible translations, missionary Bibles, etc., were exhibited. On the table was also the Festschrift "Luther und die Bibel" (a quarto volume with 676 illustrations, edited by Prof. D. Albert Schramm, Director of the Museum für Buch und Schrift in Leipzig, Mission Director D. Karl Paul and D. Willy Gerber).

At the opening service on Sunday evening, the old St. George's Church, situated not far from the "Cotta House" on the Markte, was filled to capacity by delegates, visitors and residents of Eisenach - a crowd of thousands, as at all other public services and celebrations. Hein notes in *Pastors Monthly:* "At every service, whether at eight o'clock in the morning or at six o'clock in the evening, the church with its three balconies and a seating capacity of approximately 2,500, was filled to overflowing, a wonderful trumpet quartet calling the people of Eisenach to the services by playing the dear old familiar Lutheran chorals from the spira of the church. The sermons preached by Dr. Stub, of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, Bishop von Raffey, of Budapest, Bishop Irbe, of Riga, Prelate Traub, of Stuttgart, and the farewell address of Bishop Ihmels, of Dresden, were of the highest type, a true Lutheran tone ringing in every one that we heard." "A true Lutheran tone ringing in every one" - according to other statements this might be somewhat exaggerated! In any case, D. Stub preached an orthodox sermon. His text was 1 Kings 21:1-3: "Let this be far from me, that I should give thee the inheritance of my fathers!" At no cost, Stub emphasized, even if it should cost life, should we give up or diminish our Lutheran heritage. "The celebration," says Laible, "was festive with rich liturgy and choral singing. Violently roared the song, 'Come, Holy Spirit, HER God'; you felt something of the power of the church, of the congregation standing before God, and you said to yourself, This is Lutheran church."

Monday, according to the program, was a "public day" so that those who were not invited could also get something out of the World Convention.

7) We intend to go into the content of the speeches, sermons, lectures and debates held in Eisenach in more detail in a subsequent issue of "Lehre und Wehre" (if space permits).

wanted to come. And the influx of these was great.8) After a morning devotion in the chapel of the deaconess house by Stiftsprediger Otto, they gathered in the large hall of the "Fürstenhof", which holds 1500 people and was crowded. "On the stage," writes Reu, "sat the two working committees, the German and the American, and a number of other representatives of the churches who had sent delegates, before others several bishops with the golden chain including the cross around their necks, these insignia of their dignity; we mention only the bishop of Saxony, D. Ihmels, and the Swedish archbishop, D. Söderblom. Thus he also got his money's worth who wanted something for the eye." (706.) In a photograph from Eisenach which we have seen, Knubel, Morehead, and Stub are seated on a bench with the European dignitaries adorned with their insignia.

After the song "Heart and Heart United Together", Bishop Ihmels, who had been elected chairman, gave the welcoming address. In it he recalled the meeting of the Lutheran Conference at Upsala in 1911 and the peaceless state of the world at the Eisenach meeting. "Mankind," he said, "is torn in strife and hatred. We thank God all the more reverently that we may meet here in common faith, in one spirit in this hour.... . We meet here as disciples of Jesus and speak with the Psalm according to Luther's translation: "I am in earnest... Last night we sang in the church: 'He is well with us on the plan with his spirit and gifts.' Is his spirit with us? Let us take care that we feel something of the blowing of the Spirit of God! Let us persevere in prayer for the Spirit of God!" Ihmels closed with a prayer and declared the Convention open.

The greetings followed. D. Reichardt spoke as a representative of the Thuringian Regional Church, which has now been almost completely liberalized, primarily through him. He pointed to the high priestly prayer "with its supramundane clarity and world-spanning breadth." "that they may all be one," and wished this Convention to show the world: "We children of the Reformation belong together." Archbishop Söderblom spoke on behalf of the Scandinavian churches, repeating the salutation "Beloved Brethren" in seven languages. Brandelle represented the Americans in a "richly self-conscious" manner, as

8) In his report D. Hein says: "At the Eisenach convention there were a number of younger pastors, not delegates, but visitors, who had come in spite of the exorbitant railroad fares and hotel rates. Some had walked many miles with knapsacks on their backs because they had no money to pay the railroad fare. Some had brought loaves of black bread and pieces of sausage because they could not afford to eat in a restaurant. Evidently it was love for the Lutheran Church that prompted them to go to Eisenach."

Reu noted. In a fine, well-chosen speech, city director Jansen welcomed the guests. Such foreigners, he said, who until now had only come to know Germany from descriptions of its opponents, could now convince themselves with their own eyes that Germany had nothing to do with the barbarism that had been attributed to it. He interpreted the sung song "Herz und Herz vereint zusammen" (Heart and Heart United Together) as a "song that knows no boundaries of nations". Later, at the end of the meeting, Fliedner brought greetings from Spain and wished for the strengthening of the Lutheran Church in all countries as the fruit of the Convention.

After the greetings, Morehead read his speech in German: "We want to help each other." Laible remarks: "When he stepped up to the lectern, it did not take much for him to be received with clapping hands. He has, after all, become among European Lutherans the most popular personality from America, known everywhere through his auxiliary work as a representative of the American Lutheran National Council. He gave not only his time and strength, but almost his life, for the brethren on long, self-sacrificing journeys through the countries of need and misery. Miraculously he recovered from serious illness, and as one who had been given again he appeared in Eisenach to the many who knew and loved him. The subject set before him no one else could treat so after life as he." D. Meyer from Moscow and D. Cordes from Leipzig followed with speeches in which they gave thanks, the first for Russian, the second for help given to German Lutherans.

Regarding Morehead, Reu judged, "A little less complacency and a little more restraint in detailing the accomplishments of the body the speaker [Morehead] represented would have served the lecture well and deepened its impact." Morehead had given the impression that the relief work of the National Lutheran Council was "so great that all the relief work otherwise done from America shrank in comparison with it to something insignificant." With reference to the whole meeting in the "Prince's Court," Reu expresses the hope "that some of the judgments made there about personalities and achievements will not pass unchanged into church history, otherwise one might be mistaken about the reliability of them altogether. May the world indulge in superlatives, the Church is due chastity and moderation. It is good that the Convention did not close with the public meeting in the 'Fürstenhof', otherwise one would have had to leave it with completely divided feelings.

In the afternoon everything prepared for the solemn "act of confession" on the Wartburg. Although the weather was very unfavorable, a large crowd had gathered. Eventually the rain let up, so that the celebration could be held outdoors, as planned. High on the carpeted balcony stood the speakers and before them

in the castle courtyard crowded the festive congregation. The simple boys' choirs of the Kurrendeschüler alternated with the roaring singing of the festive congregation. D. Ihmels held the German speech, in which he commemorated Luther in a sensible manner as the man who told his Germans, the Church, mankind the Word of God, the Word on which alone mankind could heal. "This hour at Wartburg Castle was to be an act of confession: let us then now confess together the eternal Word of our God as the living source and the infallible guide for all the teaching and life of the church." Thus began Ihmels the conclusion of his address, which freely reproduced Luther's interpretation of the Second Article. Loudly and solemnly the assembled then confessed the Apostolic. It was the climax of the entire public meeting. After a chant by the choir, Prof. Jacobs stepped forward. He read his speech in English, and Freiherr von Pechmann translated it sentence by sentence into German. The celebration closed with singing, prayer and benediction. In the evening D. Elert from Erlangen (formerly in Breslau) gave a "significant" lecture on the "inner future of Lutheranism" before the Thuringian "Church Conference," according to Laible, but we have not yet seen it.9) This concluded the "Public Day" of the World Convention.

9) The "A. E. L. K." reports: "For the first two public days of the World Convention, the Thuringian Ecclesiastical Conference and the Volkskirchliche Vereinigung der Christusgläubigen (the "Christliche Volksbund") in Thuringia had also scheduled their annual meetings. They wanted not only to welcome the Convention, but also to testify to their inner unity with it and to receive from it strength and joyfulness for their work." Three meetings were held. In the first, D. Elert "spoke in a perfectly formed and profound way of thought on 'the inner future of Lutheranism.'" In the following one, Kirchenrat Seidel lectured on the union of the believers in Christ throughout Germany. Then, in the public meeting, D. Laible "called for the gathering of the believers in Christ with incendiary words, and from the whole ecclesiastical situation proved this gathering to be an urgent demand of the present time." In the "A. E. L. K." it says literally: "It was a solemn moment when, in the closed afternoon meeting on August 19, delegates from the most diverse parts of Germany, who represented associations of believers in Christ or confessors of the Biblical Gospel or of the old faith, unanimously confessed this demand [to make an earnest attempt to place the work from the narrow ground of conferences to the broad ground of believing core congregations] and resolved to promote the union." The following tasks were agreed upon: "1. establishment of Bible studies in all local groups belonging to the Federation; 2. exchange of experiences, writings, pamphlets, and speakers; 3. defense of the old faith in the press, popular meetings, etc.; 4. regular meetings of leaders; 5. support of faithful biblical scholarship; 6. fraternal reaching out beyond church and national boundaries to all fellow believers for equal struggle for Christ and equal hope in the faith.

At the second public service on Tuesday morning, also in St George's Church, Bishop Raffey from Budapest preached on Rom . 8:18-22 (of the groaning creature). His theme was "What does the world expect of us?" While the remarks evidenced "warm sympathy for Germany's plight," they were not free from gushing. "What shall we say," writes Reu, "if he [Raffey] even awakened the thought that this revelation of the children of God was now, even with the World Convention, in the process of being lifted up, and that with it a new blessed time and glorious future were inaugurated? The sermon, as we remember it, did not strike a truly Lutheran note, in spite of the frequent mention of Luther's name. It was an obvious mistake to entrust Raffey with the sermon; and yet, again, it was good: it had to become evident that all kinds of Lutherans had come together for the World Convention."

After the sermon service the delegates went to the hall of the "Erholung" at the foot of the Wartburg, where the closed meetings were held. This first one on Tuesday (like the following ones) was opened with singing, reading of the Scriptures and prayer and closed with prayer. Hereupon D. Ihmels, as chairman of the German preparatory committee, asked D. Paul to read the names of those invited and deputies. Each person called rose and thus introduced himself to the assembly. On the proposal of Jacobs, the chairman of the American preparatory committee, Ihmels was elected chairman, then Neve, Pehrfson from Sweden and Paul as secretaries. The members of the Executive Committee (Söderblom, Hoppe, Pölchau, Raffey, Knubel and Stub) took their seats on the podium next to Ihmels. A Committee on Resolutions and a Committee on the Constitution were also elected. The first was formed by Jacobs, Amelung, Hein, Kaftan, Aalborg, Pehrsson, Thvedt and Zoch, the second by Danell, Brandelle, Gummerus, Holt, Laible, Meyer, Pechmann, Voigt and Wagner.

"The Chairman," says the "A. E. L. K.," "hereupon communicates the greetings received, including one from the Alliance of Reformed Churches of Presbyterian Constitution in Edinburgh; emphasizing the common confession of Christ and His salvation, until we all come near to one body in Christo. Signed was: 'In Brotherly Fellowship' the Presbyterian Alliance."

A "fraternal" greeting had also arrived from the "World Alliance of Reformed Churches", which met in Zurich from 20 to 27 July.

on Christ." "In the alliance of the 'Christ-believers'", says the "Kz.", "all associations which acknowledge the Holy Scriptures as the rule and guideline of faith and life, and see the salvation of the soul in the confession of the free grace of God in Christ, should come together for the manly representation and victorious spreading of the old faith."

had. It stated: "As the Reformed churches of the world, with few exceptions, are united among themselves, so they wish that the whole of Protestantism, irrespective of its differences, should become aware of its unity. The names Zwingli and Luther, which stand fraternally side by side on the Zwinglistin at Kappel, must never again be party names in the Church of the Reformation." (Alsatian Lutheran.) This greeting was in any case prompted by the fact that Söderblom had sent a representative to this World Federation in order to stand up for the union of all Protestants in the world. The World Convention commissioned Ihmels to answer the greetings, a custom which, as is well known, had rarely blossomed in the former General Synod of our country. Whether and how Ihmels answered is not known. But if the Lutheran World Convention wants to "reawaken the spirit of the Reformation in the Church of the Reformation," as Laible says, the answer must be, as in Marburg in 1529: "You have a different spirit than we."

The departed friends of the World Convention, D. Larsens and D. Brauns, to whose honour the assembly rose from their seats. Ihmels then handed over the chair to D. Stub, who read his lecture on the "Ecumenical Character of Lutheranism". He was followed, as is the custom in Germany, by D. Gummerus from Finland, who gave a co-lecture. This was followed by discussions from the assembly. The evening belonged to free discussions about the church life in the individual countries, whereby the reports from Sweden, Norway and Austria were of particular interest.

D. Reu remarks with reference to the closed assemblies: An actual discussion was "already made almost impossible by the fact that the individual speakers were required, before they appeared, to send a slip of paper with their name on it to the chairman's table, and then, when their turn came, to speak from the lectern. This made it almost impossible for one speaker to refer to another. Those who spoke merely gave the impressions which had forced themselves upon them during the speeches, or made such additions as they were convinced were necessary or desirable. But because each speaker had only five minutes at his disposal, even this discussion could sometimes only be fragmentary".10) D. Hein remarks: "I believe that the papers and the discussions were, as a rule, too academic, and that not enough attention was given to practical questions".

10) Melhorn in the *News Bulletin:* "The convention adopted a rule relative to speaking on its floor to the effect that those desiring to make addresses should hand their names to the secretary and should provide him with a brief *resume of* what they desired to say."

Like the first one, the following meetings went according to the program. The highlight of the closed sessions was the meeting on Wednesday. The topic was: "The Confession as the Indispensable Foundation of the Lutheran Church. D. Knubel says of the World Convention, "There was a fear of interjecting anything that might cause division and dissension." D. Jörgensen of Denmark had distinguished between mobilia and immobilia in the confessions, yes, according to Melhorn, Reus and others, even between mobilia and immobilia among the confessional writings themselves, and had thereby counted the Formula of Concord among the mobilia. One sentence that was particularly offended by was, "While the Apostolic is the thoroughly immobile, the Formula of Concord belongs to the mobilia." In the reprint of Jörgensen's lecture in the "A. E. L. K.," however, the passage reads: "The Apostolic is the thoroughly immobile, while in the Formula of Concord we find mobilia." Reu remarks: "We will not decide whether this is a subsequent change or improvement; the corrector Sebelius had the original before him, and understood it as we do." (K. Z., 768.)

D. Sebelius of Rock Island (where, of course, from November 4 to 6 Söderblom took an outstanding part in the inauguration of the new seminary and the installation of the president) was the first to contradict Jörgensen. Then men like Amelung and Anthes, representatives of the Free Churches and the Lutheran Federation, also Angerstein and the Americans Hein and Reu took the floor, the latter in the testimony already communicated by "Lehre und Wehre". It was also emphasized that the right position on the confession implies that the church actually conforms to it in doctrine and practice. "The Lutheran Confession," Amelung declared, "does not want to be merely tolerated, but to rule."

More than on other days, the negotiations on Wednesday showed that there was no unity among the representatives, especially with regard to the position on the Confession and on Scripture. Jörgensen, however, was of the opinion that, in spite of the differences, the will to confess, which was evidently present in all the delegates, was sufficient for agreement. In the report of the "A. E. L. K." it says: "D. Jörgensen, in his closing words, pointed out the pleasing fact that, in spite of all the differences of opinion which arose in the discussion, the unanimous will to confess was expressed by all, that is, the basis of our unification. But if a mere general will to confess is sufficient for the unification of Lutherans, why should not a similar formal will to Scripture be a sufficient basis for the union of all Christians, Unitarians and Universalists included?

So the report of the "Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung" continues:

"The chairman emphasized once again what the presentation had already stressed, that the confession is above all a need of the congregation. Norma normans is for us the Scriptures and their core and star, Jesus Christ. To hold fast to the Word and to hold to the Lord with Scripture and confession may remain our task." Ihmels did not find a clearer tone than Jörgensen. But he knew how to bring the proceedings to a solemn end by solemnly intoning, as Reu reports, the interpretation of the second article at the conclusion of his summation, and the whole assembly spontaneously rose and joined in this most glorious of all confessions.

In the third meeting on Thursday D. Knubel gave his lecture on the subject: "That They May All Be One-What can the Lutheran Church Contribute toward That End?" The truth was rightly emphasized that all Christians in the world are now already united. But the unionist inference, often erroneously derived from the same, has not, so far as we have seen, been given the necessary clarifying answer. Melhorn still remarks: "Up to this time all the speakers had used the German language. D. Knubel indicated that English was also official in the deliberations by reading his paper in that speech." The Germans, however, immediately received a printed translation. German and English were the official languages of the World Convention, but English was always translated into German at the same time. Of all the representatives the German language was precisely, if not spoken, at least understood. "The historian," says Laible, "will note this, that at the first Lutheran World Convention German, the language of Luther, proved to be the world language intelligible to all Lutherans [assembled there]."

At the fourth closed meeting on Thursday evening, Director of Missions Paul gave a presentation on the "Development and Distinctiveness of Lutheran Mission." D. Benze was not present due to illness; but his paper was read. The subject was "How the Lutheran Mission Survived the War."

Friday was the last day of the World Convention. As early as ^9 o'clock in the morning, the fifth closed meeting began. The subject of the three lectures was "The Lutheran World Diaspora." D. Ahner dealt with points of principle. D. Hein gave special consideration to immigrants in America. It was not the first task, he said, to maintain them in their nationality, but in their Lutheran churchmanship. D. Pehrsson, of Sweden, on the other hand, thought he could say, "Whether staying at home or emigrating, the Swedes hold together as a nation, as do the rest of the northerners." In the afternoon everything was eagerly awaiting the reports which the committees still had to submit, the last thing with which the Convention was concerned. From the beginning

The leaders obviously had a twofold objective: first, to create a doctrinal basis acceptable to all those present and to their constituents; second, on the basis of this basis, to form some organization, however loose, for the continuance of the World Convention. The first had been provided for by the Resolutions Committee, the second by the Constitutional Committee. The adoption of these proposals, says Laible, was the "most important result of the World Convention."

The Confession Resolution reads: "The Lutheran World Convention acknowledges the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only source and the infallible norm of all church-teaching and all church-teaching and sees in the Confession of the Lutheran Church, especially in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and in Luther's Small Catechism, the true rendering of the Word of God." English reads this resolution in Melhorn: "The Lutheran World Convention acknowledges the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only source and the infallible norm (standard, test) of all church-teaching and -practice, and it sees in the Lutheran Confessions, especially in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, a pure exposition of the Word of God."[11]) Reu notes, "No small amount of negotiation in the committee was necessary to arrive at a unanimous version of the third resolution concerning Scripture."

The question whether these confessional statements express the Lutheran position fully and in accordance with the times, or represent a compromise, and whether all the delegates accept them in the same sense (which, apart from anything else, was evidently not the case after the debates on the confession on Wednesday), does not seem to have been discussed in the closed meeting of the Convention. D. Hein, a member of the Resolutions Committee, writes in the *Pastor's Monthly* with reference to the resolution concerning Scripture: "This resolution is very good as far as it goes. But there is something lacking. It

11) Not all of the motions presented met with the approval of the assembly. The following resolutions were adopted: 1. "In view of the present trends directed against Christian education and the confessional instruction of our baptized youth, the Lutheran World Convention calls upon all Lutheran Christians to stand up with all seriousness for the Christian instruction and education of our youth, and especially to work for the preservation of Luther's Small Catechism. 2) "In recognition of the abundant evidence of brotherly love which the Lutheran churches in need have experienced on the part of their fellow believers, the Lutheran World Convention urges Lutheran Christians not to grow weary in brotherly love until the Lord has put an end to the need. The Lutheran World Convention takes note of the establishment of a European central office for Protestant church relief work in Zurich and recommends that the Lutheran Relief Action keep in touch with this central office in its work.

should have read that the convention acknowledges the Holy Scriptures as the inspired Word of God, inspired not only in those parts that contain God's revelation as to man's salvation, but inspired in all its parts, and for this reason the only source and the infallible norm. But such a resolution could never have been adopted unanimously. Many, I am quite certain almost the majority, would have objected." Whether this was also expressed in the closed meeting of the Convention is not reported. At any rate, the resolutions of confession were unanimously called by the committee and also unanimously adopted by the floor. "The resolutions received unanimous affirmation," Melhorn notes.

The same applies to the report of the organizing committee. The main points of the report are as follows: "This committee recommended the designation of an executive group of six men: two from America, two from the central section of Europe, and two from its northern nations. These six men are to articulate the sections of the Lutheran world, so that in missionary operations, in the care of migration, in the gathering and distribution of needed relief, in testifying to the truths of evangelical faith, and in defense against persecution and sectarianism the whole Church may act in unity." *(Pastors Mthly.*, 641.) Limited cooperation is hereafter the purpose of the World Convention. On Friday evening, at a meeting of the Select Committee (Executive Committee), D. Morehead was elected President of the same.12)

12) According to the "A. E. L. K.", the adopted "Resolution for the Continuation of the World Convention" contains the following provisions: "1. A larger standing committee and a narrower committee shall be established. (2) The Select Committee shall be responsible for the conduct of business. It shall prepare the next session of the World Convention. It will make it its business to do all that can and should be done in the interest of the harmonious cooperation of the existing forces for the work of love, the care of the Diaspora, and the mission to the Gentiles of Lutheranism. In the same sense, it will also take care of the other issues to which Prof. Morehead referred in his introductory lecture. Finally, the Select Committee is to intervene when it is necessary or urgently desirable for serious reasons to speak or act in the interest and on behalf of Lutheranism as a whole [as, for example, in the case of the church robbery in Riga]. 3. (3) The Select Committee shall consist of the following gentlemen until the next session of the World Convention: D. Ihmels, D. Jörgensen, D. Morehead, D. Lars Boe, the president of St. Olaf's College in Minnesota, D. Freiherr D. Pechmann, Bishop D. Lundgren. 4. The Select Committee will be constituted as soon as practicable. All details of management will be left to it. (5) The wider committee is intended to establish a living link between the narrower committee and all the Lutheran countries represented in the World Convention or continuing to join it. To this end it shall include: Seven to ten representatives each from Germany and the United States of America, three representatives each from Sweden, two representatives each from Denmark and the United States of America.

According to the judgment of some delegates, an actual organization involving church fellowship did not take place in Eisenach. The resolutions adopted had no such significance. D. Hern writes with reference to these resolutions, for which he also voted: "Nor was the object of the convention to bring about a great organization embracing all who claim to be Lutherans. An organization of that kind would presuppose that all who call themselves Lutherans really are Lutherans. ... If any of the delegates came to Eisenach with the intention of bringing about the organization of a Lutheran World Alliance, they were disappointed. Not only the representatives of the conservative synods of the United States, but also those of the free churches of Germany and, possibly, of some other countries, the members, of the *Lutheran Federation* and possibly some of the state churches would have objected and, as a last resort, withdrawn if others had insisted on forming such an organization. Some of us may condemn the whole convention as unionistic in its inception and its aims, - though the proper time to register their objections would have been when this matter was discussed on the floor of Joint Synod, - but they are not justified in charging the convention with the attempt to form an anti-Scriptural and anticonfessional union of so-called Lutherans." Whether these thoughts were shared by

mark, Finland, Norway, and one representative from each of the other countries. In countries where there are several independent constituted Lutheran churches, or where within a church there is a grouping according to nationality [as in Poland], each of these individual churches or groups will be granted its own confidant. Regional Bishop D. Ihmels and Prof. D. Morehead are asked to see to it that the exact number of members is determined and that the members are appointed jointly. 6. both committees complement each other by co-option when gaps occur. 7. D. Miller has suggested that the composition of the next World Convention be so arranged that the number of trusted men apportioned to each church shall be determined according to the number of ordained ministers, including professors of theology, belonging to it. Pros. D. Karl Pröhl has suggested the establishment of a general Lutheran study aid. Both suggestions are referred to the Select Committee." (Sp. 788.) Concerning the third point, D. Ren's report says: "Because the American representatives [Morehead and Boe] had been recommended to the committee [Constitution Committee] on the ground of a special meeting of only a part of the American delegates, the representatives of the Norwegian Church of America, the Ohio and Iowa Synods were placed in the unpleasant necessity of protesting against it. The result was the issuance of the statement that the election of the American representatives was not to be considered final until it had been approved by the American synods represented at Eisenach. When the continuation committee [the elected executive: Ihmels, Pechmann, Jörgensen, Lundgren, Morehead, Boe] then on the evening of the same day still elected D. Morehead as chairman, then unfortunately this wants to appear as a non-observance of the just mentioned declaration." (K. Z. 1924, 26.)

of the public discussion in the Convention is not said. Nor is it clear how one is to explain the unanimously adopted resolutions, if not as the most feasible organization possible on the most orthodox basis of all delegates and possibly also of all their churches and synods. D. Reu remarks: "From the adoption of the recommendations of the Constitutional Committee it is clear that in Eisenach really something permanent has been created, but also that it has been kept within modest limits. Apart from the preparation for the next Convention (probably in 1930) and the authority to speak for the Lutheran Church in compelling cases, the Continuation Committee has only to advise and recommend; it has no authority to act." "Constitution, after all, is merely in place and possible where something permanent is involved. But that something permanent should emerge from the Convention, which in its entire character was nothing other than a free conference, was the wish of many, but it was by no means certain. Some, indeed, would have preferred that nothing permanent should have been created in any way; others desired a loosely permanent organization, while still others would have preferred to bring into being a regular confederation, a world Lutheran alliance. The middle line retained the victory."

With reference to the resolutions adopted in Eisenach, the iowaschen "Kirchenblatt" of November 3 states: "If we understand this correctly, then one assumes that this world convention is a permanent connection. One then naturally asks: connection of whom? By those who were in Eisenach, or by the churches to which these Lutherans belong? But who gave these men a commission to organize such a permanent connection? And the main question: on what does this connection rest, which calls itself the Lutheran World Convention?" The answer to these questions follows from what has been said. And as far as American synods are concerned, it goes without saying that the Eisenach decisions apply only to those that ratify them. But it seems equally self-evident that delegates who voted for the adoption of the same have thereby also undertaken to represent them from their Synods. The first step in this direction has already been taken in the United Lutheran Church. The *Lutheran* of November 22 carried an article to this effect with the headline: "Executive Board accepts Eisenach resolutions subject to final convention-approval next October - the United Lutheran Church o-kays the organization of Lutheranism proposed by the World Convention and will cooperate to achieve objectives." In any case, this is consistent and consistent with the Eisenach resolutions. However, urging caution, D. Reu writes: "Do not be in such a hurry to act and, as far as America is concerned, do not act as if the synods had already said yes and amen to the resolutions.

of Eisenach and had already acknowledged the actions of their delegates. Make haste! The work of support hurries, but that can continue to be effectively driven in the manner hitherto. . . . Beware, too, of any step that in any degree presupposes the pulpit and altar fellowship of the circles involved, which, after all, does not exist. Otherwise, over there, the Lutheran Federation and the Free Church must resign, or a number of the American synods cannot participate either."

Friday evening at 6 o'clock the public closing service took place in St. George's Church, in which Prelate D. Traub from Stuttgart preached the farewell sermon on Matth. 28, 20: "I am with you always, even to the end of the age. "Under this slogan, he explained, we who are apart want to stay together," said Laible. Traub found "the right word," notes Reu. The service was followed at 8-1/2 o'clock by the public farewell meeting. Melhorn writes: "St. George's Church again was crowded, and the congregation listened to a series of addresses by delegates who told what they believed the convention had accomplished. Prof. A. R. Wentz of Gettysburg Seminary was among the brethren who spoke, and his analysis evoked the approval of all who listened to him." The speakers, besides Wentz, were Bishop Danell and the Tamule Prof. Arivinadam. D. Danell referred to the distress of the times. "No words can express what the heart feels in this hour," he began. Humanity, he said, is more than ever sunk in distress and suffering. Out of the ruins, however, a new humanity will be built, he said. God's judgments are always full of love and mercy. In his time it will be revealed that they have only prepared the way for the kingdom of justice and love. All God's ways are grace and truth. Wentz then enthusiastically described the impressions that the delegates had received from the World Convention.13) In his speech, the Indian found that

13) The main passages of this address, which is also found in English in the *Lutheran Quarterly, are* as follows: "First impression: by God's grace the Convention was a success. Beyond the wildest hopes of those in whose hearts the idea of a Lutheran World Convention had arisen, ... the first ecumenical council of the Lutheran Church was a success. Whether one looks at the large number of representatives who appeared, or at the high degree of unanimity in which the delegates were together, or at the spirit of devotion of our worship services, the scholarly elevation and ecclesiastical attitude of the papers, the many personal relationships that were forged, the spirit of brotherly love and Christian fellowship that prevailed from beginning to end, and the great significance of the practical decisions made in this afternoon's session, the first ecumenical council of the Lutheran Church has been an undoubted success. . . . Second impression: What diversity is appropriate to the Lutheran Church! We have come from many countries with many languages. ... Thus the Convention itself presented in a concrete way the ecumenical character of Lutheranism.... Diverse as the peoples of the earth themselves ...

also the beautiful word: "Only the Gospel can save my people, only the Gospel can save the German people, can save the world." Bishop Ihmels then ascended the pulpit (the others had spoken from the lectern) and in his parting words exhorted the people to be faithful to the faith and the confession of the Lutheran Church.14) "One went

our sitting together around the Convention table and our deliberating on important issues powerfully signifies the truth that the sun never sets on the Lutheran kingdom, that a glorious belt of Lutheranism wraps itself around the globe, and that wherever there are people capable of worshipping God, be they of whatever stripe or language or color they choose, the Lutheran church can flourish. - Third impression: The essential unity of the Lutheran Church. That such a representative assembly of Lutherans from all countries, so clearly representing the diverse character of the Lutheran Church, with such a diversity of church constitutions, with such real differences of opinion on questions of practice, could sit together for five days and discuss in brotherly love questions of Lutheranism and develop plans for the further development and spread of the Lutheran faith, was only possible because behind the outward differences there was a true unity of spirit. This essential unity of Lutherans of all lands was deeply felt throughout the Convention and more than once filled our hearts with songs of praise. This essential unity of Lutheran churches throughout the world, which was revealed last week, is far more important than any union of these churches. It rests mainly on our common faith in Christ as our Saviour, from our common acceptance of the Bible as God's Word, and the common acceptance of the confessions of the church. ... The fourth impression is that a glorious future lies before our Lutheran Church. ... The absolutions adopted with such great unanimity in today's business session give assurance that the first Lutheran World Convention will not be the last. From now on the Lutheran Church will be able to speak as one. The strength of the whole will become the strength of each part. Across the seas... ... a bond of united Lutheran organization will soon stretch across the seas, a bond which it is to be hoped will grow stronger and stronger as time goes on, and thus help Lutherans of all lands to realize the prayer of our Lord: "that they may all be one. Many of us come away from this first Lutheran World Convention with the hope that what has happened here is in reality the beginning of a new period in the history of the Lutheran Church. In millions of hearts this hope will find an echo, and millions of prayers will ascend to the throne of grace, that these hopes may become a reality, and that the Lutheran Church with its glorious history may attain to a still more glorious future through this first Lutheran World Convention." (A. E. L. K, sp. 790.)

14) Ihmels based his farewell address on Apost. 20, 32: "And now, brethren, I commend you to God and to the word of His grace," etc. In the witty execution it is said, among other things: "Faster than we thought, the days of fraternal togetherness have passed for us members of the World Convention." All that remains for him to do is to conclude. And how should that end

apart," Laible concluded his report, "many with moved hearts. All were under the impression: something had happened, and something will happen. There was also no doubt that a bond of the heart had been formed that had not existed before among the Lutherans. Thus the Convention was a sign of light in a dark time. It is still a young child; God let it grow to manhood of Christ!" (Sp.791.)

design? "The first is a word of reverent gratitude to the God who has brought us together here and has wonderfully blessed us during these days. But we also thank all the people who have contributed to the success of this meeting. ... To be able to give thanks at parting, that is joy." "Our German language has a beautiful word: 'God be commanded!' In truth, it is something very great that we may command one another into the hand of God in parting. We have a right to do this only because in Christ JEsu the door to God's eternal Father's house was opened to us, and in faith in Christ we may greet each other as God's children. What can happen to children when they take refuge in the hand of their Father? Therefore, God be commanded! Let this be the last word which we cry one to another." But, as the Epistle to the Hebrews testifies, for man to fall into the hands of the living God is a terrible thing. "Our conscience understands this. This living God, after all, is the Holy One, and the Scriptures in another place compare Him to a consuming fire. How then shall we commend ourselves into the hands of this God, if we are not sure of his grace in Christ? The holy God and we sinners - are these not irreconcilable opposites? I fear, dear fellow members of our convent, that even in these days many things are accusing us before our God. How we ourselves would have liked to do many things differently than they have turned out! Praise be to God that I may also write the word grace at the close of this Convention, and may speak it into your souls in such a way that it may illuminate them and yet make you joyful. Yea, with the Lord there is much mercy, and he covereth the multitude of sins. Therefore let us flee together this day unto the grace of God, before we join hands in parting." But of the grace of God we know only in Christ, and of Christ only through his word. "Therefore everything depends on our taking hold of this word in faith and taking refuge in this word. It is true that the grace of God can cause a unique feeling of joy in a person; but - feelings come and go. If we had to base our certainty about God on feelings, we would base it on sand. But now we may cleave to the word of our God, which abideth for ever." But let the purpose and aim of grace be to edify us and to give us an inheritance among all who are sanctified. And great be the multitude of them that from all the ends of the earth draw with us toward the eternal city of God. "Come then, let us now join hands in parting, and pledge but one thing to our God and to one another, that we will remain united in that faith and hope until we arrive at the gates of the eternal inheritance." In the reports, which we also followed above, it is said that in his closing speech Ihmels also exhorted all to faithfulness to the Lutheran confession. From the speech, however, as it is printed in the "A. E. L. K." (Sp. 817-820), this does not appear.

Finally, in a letter published in the *News Bulletin of* the N. L. C. of September 20, Ihmels addressed the Lutherans of America as follows: "From the Lutheran World Convention at Eisenach, as chairman, I send a hearty and fraternal greeting to the Lutheran synods of America. In the common confession of God's Word and Luther's teaching we have gathered together from all the ends of the earth in order to work together, and from our heart we thank the synods of America which also have sent their representatives to Eisenach. Not less do we extend thanks to these representatives for the valuable service which they rendered at our sessions. Their important papers, sermons, and addresses as well as their effective participation in the debates have added not a little to the success of the convention. In the final analysis all the work of the convention was for the name that is above every name - 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.' In this name I also greet the American brethren and with my whole heart ask them that in this name we may stand together in the future in order to work together, fight together, and together win the victory. Jesus lives, Jesus reigns, Jesus conquers!" Reu gives Ihmels the testimony: "With her rich spiritual power and her shining love for her church, this outstanding personality had been an excellent leader of all assemblies, who had understood how to lead the Convention to the heights again and again."

How is the World Convention to be judged? Only Missouri, it sounds reproachful in some reports, was not represented. Why did we not participate in Eisenach? Why did we not avoid the odinm which will now meet us again all over the world? Of that, D. v., next time. F. B.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From the Synod: The theological faculty of Concordia College in Adelaide, South Australia, has appointed three members of the St. Louis theological faculty, namely Professors Bente, Fürbringer and Dau, as Doctors of Theology honoris causa. It justifies this act in the following words: "1. They are men who for many years by word of mouth and by the publication of theological books and treatises have done much for the Lutheran Church in America, proving themselves reliable leaders in matters of doctrine and life in an age of religious indifferentism and spiritual decline in the Christian Church at large. 2. they have had a great measure of influence in the healthy growth and development of the Lutheran Church, not only in the United States, Canada, and South America, but also in other countries of the Western World. 3. Their con-

tributions to the religious literature of our Church have been, and still are, regularly read even in this far-off land of Australia and no doubt have exerted a wholesome influence on this section of the Lutheran Church as well as on that of other countries in the East. 4 The three professors have been so linked together in their work that it would, indeed, seem unfairly discriminatory to separate them in this our public recognition of their services. Since it is impossible at this juncture to send a representative of our faculty to America for the purpose of conferring the title on the venerable professors in a formal manner, we ask you to act in our behalf and to arrange for a suitable presentation of the diplomas. With fraternal greetings, in the name of the faculty, yours sincerely, C. F. Graebner, Director." The undersigned, in a ceremony arranged by the local Board of Supervisors in the Church of the Holy Cross, performed the conferring of the Faculty of Theology at Adelaide. At the same festive service, also on behalf of the Supervisory Authority, V. P. E. Kretzmann was inducted into the office of Professor of Theology at the Concordia here. We hereby also publicly welcome the new colleague. F. P.

Women's suffrage in the Purified Church of Norway. In *Lutheran Church Herald* we read: "The question of woman suffrage in our Church has not been settled. In the former Norwegian Synod, as far as we know, there were no congregations which had given suffrage to women. In the United Church and the Hauge Synod a few congregations had woman suffrage, but in these church organizations there were different views, especially in the United Church, where men like Dr. Boeckman and the late Dr. Kildahl held different opinions on this question. The question was not discussed by the pro-union committees, but after the union the matter was submitted to the theological faculty, which has not yet reported. We venture to make the guess that the reason for not reporting is that the members of the faculty cannot agree on a report. We have received a couple of papers on this question, but had hoped to hear from the faculty before printing them and opening up a general discussion. Meanwhile several congregations have woman suffrage, and no special objection has been raised by the officials of the Church. So far no woman delegates have been admitted to the annual meeting. Neither did the United Church or the Hauge Synod have any woman delegates at their annual meetings. The United Church on several occasions refused admittance to congregations which had adopted constitutions allowing women the right to vote. Where our last annual report places a woman on the Church Council, this is a misprint." Recommended is the study of the paper Prof. Daus: *Woman Suffrage in the Church* inF . B.

Lutheran Brotherhood of America. The main purpose of this association, which has members in almost all the Lutheran synods of our country, is a unionistic one. Chas. H. Boyer of Chicago, at their last meeting in Madison, Wis. declared that the Brotherhood had set itself two principal objects: the purification of the Lutheran Church, and the establishment of a Lutheran University. "The first of these undertakings," said Boyer, "is somehow to obliterate, or make less prominent, the inexcusable and deplorable divisions in our own Church; divisions which

have nothing whatever to do with the fundamentals of our religion, but only exist because of differences of opinion as to unessentials. It is no secret that Lutheran unification will be realized only when the laymen sentiment throughout the various subdivisions of the Lutheran Church becomes so pronounced and so strong that it will force some such get- together steps on our church authorities. This is not guess-work; we all know that this is so from past experience in our own and in other denominations. Whatever has been accomplished along that line in the past, and the movements now on foot, have been and are due to the insistent demand of Christian laymen 'that all His disciples be one, that the world may know that God has sent Him.' And this is not said to disparage clergymen as such, because many of the most influential ministers in both the Lutheran and other evangelical Protestant churches are heartily in accord with the laymen in this movement and are doing everything in their power to advance the cause. On the other hand, it would be foolish for us to shut our eyes to the well-known fact that somehow, for some reasons that are apparent, and for some that are not, there is a great deal of indifference, not to say opposition, in the ranks of ministers to all unionistic or cooperative movements between the various synods of the American Lutheran Church." Certainly there are many among the Lutheran laity who neither know nor know how to judge the doctrinal differences that now divide Lutherans. There are, after all, far more than a hundred pastors in the United Lutheran Church who think they can unite Logentum and Lutheranism! Such people, however, who are weak in knowledge, should not set themselves up as leaders and spokesmen for Lutheranism. In the Lutheran Church, any unification of doctrinal differences has been considered a reprehensible unionism. F. B.

Concerning the perdition of "Protestant" Christianity, the *Princeton Theological Review* (p. 362) states: "Christianity is in greater peril to-day than ever before in its long history. It is the peril of abandoning Jesus Christ as the Redeemer from sin. There are those who say that it is a disaster which has already come. 'There seems to be an effort,' writes one of my correspondents, the rector of an Episcopal church in New England, 'to explain Christianity without Christ.' Another says: 'Something has eaten the heart out of Protestant Christendom, and we have only the husk or the ghost of the shadow of it left.' A distinguished minister of the Congregational Church writes: 'The Protestant pulpit, with rare and fine exceptions, has ceased to preach the absolute need of redemption through the Cross of Christ.' These things are said of the Protestant Church, and by ministers in the Protestant Church, that Church which came into being because it had, or claimed to have, a great answer to a great question, 'What must I do to be saved?' The sad thing about so much of the so-called Christian writing and teaching and preaching of the day is that a great part of it might have been done just as well by one who was not a Christian. We must get back into the Christian pulpit that note of independence and enthusiasm, that consciousness of having a truth to proclaim different from anything the world knows or can know, or the Christian church will be merged and sunk in the currents of this world's thought. I recently read a book of sermons preached by a dis-

tinguished Congregational minister before university congregations. From beginning to end there was not a sermon dr a paragraph or sentence which proclaimed Christ as the Savior from sin." Her complaint and indictment, from which we have only reproduced quite a few sentences, the *Review* concludes, as follows: "On the northwest tower of St. Paul's in London hangs the great bell known as 'Great Paul.' The bell bears this inscription from the Vulgate: 'Vae mihi, si non evangelisavero! Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel!'" Yes, woe to the Church that tramples on her divine calling to be the preacher of the blessed message of the forgiveness of sins in the blood of Christ! F. B.

The Student Volunteer Movement, The crass unionist character of this movement is expressed in its last *bulletin*, among other things, as follows: "The movement is frequently challenged by one group or another who believe that their own particular views should prevail in such an organization. To all such attacks the reply of leaders in the movement has been steadfastly the same: The movement as such cannot stand for any one theological position, for any one social theory, for any one wing, radical or conservative. Its members consist of those who purpose to interpret Jesus Christ in those parts of the world where He is least known, and inevitably that category will include people who differ widely as to what their interpretation shall be. The greatest service the movement can render both to individuals and to the mission-field is to bring together there individuals in larger or smaller groups, where an interchange is possible, and where all may learn - to use the now classic phrase of a Chinese Christian leader - to 'agree to differ but resolve to love.'" (P. 159.) In this student movement, then, all tendencies are justified, even the most liberal and radical. Confessionalism is denounced in the same *bulletin* as "bigotry and narrowness, intolerance, formalism and hypocrisy." How can Lutherans, which has happened in the past, participate in this movement? F. B.

"Inspiration In Spots." In *Bible Champion (*1923, p. 599) we read, "Again we must press the question, the all-important question, If the Bible is inspired only in spots, which spots are inspired? Who is to decide? Who has the wisdom to tell us with satisfying certainty? We have read after Graf, Wellhausen, Cheyne, Driver, and Robertson Smith down to Kent, Foster, Bade, Fosdick, Faunce, Merril, and the rest, and do not feel that we can trust either their logic or their judgment. Then, who can point out to the world the parts of the Bible that are inspired and the parts that are not inspired? The world ought to have certainty in this matter." The posittven scientific theologians say that in the Bible only that is to be regarded as divine which man experiences as true. The question arises again: How can this experience be ascertained? Whose experience is to apply to all in Christendom? etc. There can no longer be any question of real certainty and universally valid truth in theology when the decision is taken away from Scripture and man, the individual, is made the measure of all things. F. B.

II. foreign countries.

The great need in Germany. D. G. C. König of New York, who is in charge of the present relief action of our Synod for the alleviation of the distress in Germany, has sent us, among others, the following statements. Ambassador Houghton writes from Berlin: "Matters here are drifting along from bad to worse. The conditions are very severe. Help is absolutely justified. I can only hope and pray that it may come soon." *New Republic:* "The ease of Germany is without precedent among nations." *New York Tribune: "*With the approach of winter the cases of individual distress are multiplying. Recently a well-dressed woman was seen to pick up a raw potato out of the gutter, carefully wipe it off and put it into a satchel. A short distance farther on the same street a woman was seen surreptitiously filling her satchel from a horse's feed-bag." Dr. Emerson of Columbia University: "After four days' study of Berlin hospitals, orphanages, baby wards, schoolchildren, and homes of the unemployed I find undernourishment wide-spread. One quarter of the city's population is dependent on government and private charity. The shortage of food, coal, light, and houses, combined with diminishing medical and hospital facilities, is causing an increase in disease." Henry Brown, head of Quaker organization in Germany: "The unemployed in Berlin receiving government doles has increased from 220,000 in November to 500,000 late in December. They receive a subsidy of only eighteen cents a day, while a loaf of bread costs fifteen cents." "In forty-six large German cities the death-rate from tuberculosis exceeds that of last year by about twenty per cent. Fifty per cent, and more, of all children in large towns and industrial districts are underfed to a dangerous degree. In Dresden 22 per cent, of children in elementary schools suffer from curvature of the spine." Report from Quaker headquarters to General Allen: "Altogether seven million children are in urgent need of food. The mortality rate of babies during the last three months was 21 per cent, higher than last year, although the birth-rate in Berlin declined by 30 per cent. Half of the newly born children have been transferred to orphan asylums, since the parents cannot provide for them. Approximately three million people are without underclothing and shoes. Babies are without swaddling-clothes, and in many instances bedclothing is entirely missing." The American Herring reports, also from Berlin, that as early as the middle of October last year there were 1,500,000 unemployed in unoccupied Germany, to which must now be added 5,000,000 workers who are only partially employed, including 2,000,000 who have only half time and less work. All this in unoccupied Germany alone! Who can estimate what a measure of misery and distress these figures contain? Probably never before has the misery been so great in a great nation as it is now in Germany. And we Americans cannot merely help, we owe it to the Germans to help. And not merely out of a merciful Samaritan love, but, as everyone knows, also for many other, less honorable reasons. Our people have helped to inflict the deadly wounds, etc. So America, too, should no longer refuse to at least help soothe and bandage these terrible bruises. As it seems, the Federal Council now also wants to take care of the plight of the Germans. However, in view of the still in wide strata of our

What will really come out of it, if the German affliction of the people is really adequate? For us Lutherans this must be an incentive to all the greater zeal in this noble work of love. F. B.

Inspiration of the Hebrew Bokalzeichen. In the September number of the "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt" (organ of the Lutheran Federation) Dr. Amelung brings the following "correction": "In No. 1 of the 'Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt' (October 1922) I had remarked in a review of Dr. phil. H. Ebeling, 'Die Bibel Gottes Wort und des Glaubens einzige Quelle' (The Bible God's Word and Faith's Only Source), I had remarked that Ebeling advocated divine inspiration of the Hebrew vowel letters. I believed that this was the meaning of his remarks, which were not entirely clear on this point. Pastor W. Ösch in Stuttgart was of a different opinion. We corresponded amicably on the question. To be on the safe side, Pastor Ösch contacted Dr. Ebeling himself, and he confirmed to him that he had 'in no way wanted to assert an inspiration of the vowel signs'. This correction I do not fail to mistrust to the readers of the 'Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt.'" The false charge has also been made from time to time against Missouri that it teaches the inspiration of the Hebrew vowel signs. Inspired are the words of Scripture (which, of course, are not without vowels), but not the vowel signs of later times. F. B.

The Dishonesty of the Liberals. Rudolf Otto (Marburg) wrote in the "Christliche Welt" about the "belief in resurrection": "The apostles proclaim their Lord as the 'resurrected one', the 'risen one', the 'exalted one'. There can be no doubt that the people of that time somehow associated physical images with this. This corresponds to their conception of the world and to that of antiquity. But he who believes that he must retain the bodily conception of 'raised' and 'risen', ought to realize that he must do the same for the expression 'the exalted one'. For 'exaltation' is, in the mere sense of the word, also a spatial conception, presupposes an existence in space and thus the ancient idea that 'heaven', that is, God's eternal kingdom, was somewhere high up in space. This idea was not difficult for the ancients, who still associated spatial ideas with 'heaven'. But for us heaven and the eternal world of God are as little in space or time as God Himself, but in God's eternity. And that is apart from space and time. In this connection the expressions 'resurrection' and 'resurrection' in no way lose their meaning. In contrast to the idea of 'immortality,' which actually denies real death, they mean restoration from a real state of death to real life, yes, only introduction into full and real life in general. . . We will judge the later stories of the 'empty tomb' like the stories that later surrounded the birth of Jesus: as a sacred legend, in which, according to the forms of perception of those times, the irrational relationship of the eternal to the temporal is reflected." If the Marburg lecturer had been an honest opponent of Christianity, he would (as the "A. E. L. K." remarks) have declared roundly and frankly: "We liberals deny the resurrection of Christ from the dead as recorded in Scripture, and declare the adherence to the Easter message of the apostles to be folly."

F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Year 70. **February 1924.** **No. 2.**

From the history of the English hymn.

A conference presentation.

That the hymn is of the greatest importance to church life is universally acknowledged. It is, after all, the part of the service in which the congregation is directly and collectively active, not merely through the mouth of the pastor. In the hymn, the congregation directly and corporately offers to God the sacrifice of the lips: Worship, invocation, praise, and thanksgiving. The hymn owes its origin to the power of Christian faith; it is born of the living experience of the great saving facts of God in the heart of the Christian. And because these great facts of salvation are common to all Christians, the hymn unites all believers into a priestly people who now sacrifice and serve God together as a spiritual priesthood. And to this must be added the fact that the hymn also has very great significance for Christian private life. With the catechism and the Bible verses, the knowledge of which the catechism imparts, the hymn-book is the house-book of Christianity, often the only devotional book in the home. The songs and hymn verses learned in school and sung in church accompany the Christian through life and form the easiest and best point of contact in private devotions. For this reason, the editing of a hymnal is not an easy task, but one of the most difficult, important, and responsible, and the selection of songs to be sung in worship and learned in school is not a trivial, secondary thing, but a matter of great, far-reaching importance, of which we pastors and teachers are not always fully aware, and the implications of which we cannot always gauge, much less follow in congregational life and Christian life. Quite rightly says General Superintendent D. Zöllner: "Our hymn is our very special treasure. The action of the congregation during the Reformation gave birth to it. In it the congregation showed itself everywhere at that time. The jubilation of the newly free evangelical faith cannot be better represented than with the words: "Now rejoice, dear Christians, and be glad.

Let us jump joyfully,' etc." (Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung, 1915, p. 728.) And Seminary Director Otto Eberhard writes: "The church song is not only, like its sister, the German folk song, the property of a certain period, for instance of the youth, but it belongs to the whole community, to the people par excellence. It is learned by children, criticized by those in the ferment, explained by life, learned and understood anew by adults, deepened by progressive experience, transfigured in old age, proven in death. It accompanies you from the cradle to the grave, and, springing from the needs of inner and outer life, lends expression to all your needs." (Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 39,285.) But while our old, good German *Hymn-Book* succeeded at first throw, our English *Hymn-Book*, even in its fourth arrangement, is not yet what it ought to be, though our present *Ev. Lutheran Hymn-Book* decidedly and far surpasses its predecessors. It is, of course, also a much more difficult task to produce an English Lutheran hymnal than a German one.

Now what is a true hymn? It should really be a song, and, as the word song indicates, a folk song, a popular, poetic expression of what is common to all Christians. It must not be pompous, not rhetorical, not learned, not created and edited at the study table, one should not smell the study lamp on it, but it must be plain, simple, understandable to all, but real poetry, not rhymed prose. And at the same time the right hymn is ecclesiastical. It sings of the great deeds of the Gospel as they are given by Scripture and live in the faith of the Church.

A few examples may explain this. When I visited the Berlin Cathedral on a Sunday a number of years ago and looked a little more closely at the hymnal handed to me before the service began, I also found in it the song by Matthias Claudius: "Guter Mond, du gehst so stille durch die Abendwolken hin." This is indeed a hymn, but not a church hymn, but a folk song. In contrast, J. J. Rambach's catechism song in our hymnal (No. 456): Gesetz und Evangelium Sind beide Gottesgaben, Die wir in unserm Christentum Beständig nötig haben,

is indeed ecclesiastical, but it is not a song, but rhymed prose. And now the song of the pious, but pietistically oriented Woltersdorf with the heading: "The most necessary of the various religions, churches and sects for brief instruction for the faithful"! This title alone shows that Woltersdorf had no real understanding of what a hymn is. The purpose of a hymn is not actually instruction, teaching, or, most of all, a lesson.

At least dogmatic-polemical instruction. And this is then also shown by the execution in 66 verses! The Roman Catholics are treated, the Greek Catholics, the Reformed, etc. The seventh verse of the Reformed reads:

> The Reformed are quite different from the papacy, but they and we do not yet have complete peace. Partly their concept of the Lord's Supper is too bad for us, partly some do not teach the election of grace correctly.

But Luther's hymn, "Nun freut euch, liebe Christen g'mein," Herberger's "Valet will ich dir geben," Paul Gerhardt's "Mein Herze geht in Sprüngen" (No. 366, 15), Speratus' "Es ist das Heil uns kommen her"-these are real, proper church hymns, truly churchy and real songs.

Quite the same thing lies in the English expression *church-hymn*, not
It should be a "hymn", a hymn, a song to the praise and glory of God. The very designation says that it is to be dignified, not a ringing of words, not trivial or even ridiculous. And it should be one, an ecclesiastical song, expressing the truths that are known and experienced in the church.

A church-hymn is, for example, R. Heber's "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty" (No. 263) or also J. Keble's evening hymn "Sun of My Soul, Thou Savior Dear" (No. 42) or W. C. Dix's Epiphany hymn "As with Gladness Men of Old" (No. 183). Who Maria Anderson's "Our Country's Voice is Pleading" (No. 472) with its "Alleghany Mountains" unb "Missouri's fountains" is neither a in the right sense of the word nor achurch-hymnebensuch as "From Greenland's Icy Mountains, from India's Coral Strand" with its much-discussed verse, "And only man is vile" (No. 474). And Fannie Crosby's "Pass Me Not, O Gentle Savior," though a song, is poetically felt, but not a hymn, least of all a Lutheran hymn, but a Methodist revival hymn.

Now, in order to judge properly of the English hymn, with which we shall deal briefly today, one should know at least in its main features the history and development of it; nor must one apply a false standard and make an undue promotion. The English Church cannot give us something which it has not itself. The English Church is by and large Reformed, and as certainly as the Reformed Church has only attenuated, stunted, and adulterated the Gospel, so certainly it cannot have produced great, strong songs of faith and confession, such as our Lutheran Church possesses as the fruit of the preaching of the Gospel. In addition to this, in the period in which our own hymns were mainly composed, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the English Church produced only a few hymns.

songs have arisen occasionally and quite sporadically. The founding, the first flourishing and the time of suffering of the English Protestant Church - and the founding and the flourishing and the time of suffering of a church have always exerted a great influence on church poetry, as the songs of the Thirty Years' War and the songs of Paul Gerhardt show - have passed by in the English Church almost without a trace for the church song. Free hymnody was frowned upon in the English Church; it was connected with Reformed church ethos that for nearly two hundred years people sang mainly only versified psalms. One wanted only divine songs, not songs freely composed by men. But what a poor German hymnal we would have if we had no hymns before the year 1700! Neither the Pietistic period, nor the rationalistic, nor the revivalist period of the nineteenth century has been able to strike again in the German Lutheran Church the true note of the genuine hymn, the great, strong, objective congregational and confessional hymn. We must not, therefore, expect from the English Church something which it has not and could not have. This also the English Church unreservedly acknowledges in its truly discerning representatives. We will all agree with the words of the famous pedagogue Karl v. Raumer when he says: "In the hymns of Luther, his fellow-workers and followers - what soul is in them! Springing from the heart, they go to the heart, uplift it, comfort, teach, instruct, so that one always feels in the land of the believed truth, in God's community, ... Having become one with many others who are driven before God's throne by a concern, a hope, a consolation, one feels oneself in a stream towards the other world, feels what it is: I believe a Christian church and an eternal life." (Ev.-Luth. Schulblatt 53, 155.) Who expresses the same, admittedly in quite a different manner, another scholar, when he says in a poem on the German song:

The German song is unique, A treasure for mind and heart, Lifted from the depths, Where joy dwells and pain.

No other people on earth enjoyed the favor of fate, to collect such a treasure, rich in nature and art.

The one who said this is not a German, not a German-American, but the American professor A. H. Palmer; and the other American professor, Theodore Brown Hewitt, prefaces his work *Paul Gerhardt as a Hymn-writer and His Influence on English Hymnody with this* motto (p. VII). It is for this reason that the Episcopalian Catherine Winkworth, in her *Lyra Germanica*, *has* translated the best and most glorious German hymns into English, and quite rightly Prof. D. H. E. Jacobs judges of her: "Catherine Winkworth, an Anglican, has done more for Lutheran hymnology in the English language than all Lutherans combined who use that language in their services."

(Lutheran Church Review, 29,273.) Therefore Julian, in his famous, comprehensive *Dictionary of Hymnology, says:* "The treasures of Lutheran hymnology have enriched the churches of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Scotland^ England, America." Grove in his great Dictionary of *Music*, also justly esteemed, says, taking text and melody together: 'Luther is the establisher of congregational singing. The chorale originated by Luther cannot be surpassed for dignity and simple devotional earnestness." F. L. Humphreys, Aus. Dr., judges, "Those *Choraele* are so elevated and at the same time so simple and devotional that they are beyond question the most perfect models of hymn-tunes. It is humiliating to compare our [American] collections with those in German churches." And Prof. H. W. Parker, one of the most eminent American composers, judges of one of the best American hymnals, that of the Episcopal Church, that it is "a painful exhibition of vulgarity tempered by incompetency-- The best hymn-tunes come from Germany and the worst from America."

Should we not have only Lutheran songs sung and learned in our English Lutheran churches and schools? That would certainly be the best and most beautiful thing and must always be the goal. Quite correctly, Prof. D. A. Hult wrote some years ago in a remarkable article on "The Future American Lutheran Hymn-book": "The general spirit of the American Lutheran hymn-book should be decisively Lutheran, just as a Methodist hymnal in America is decisively Methodistic." (Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 43, 220.) Nevertheless, at present we do not wish to make the demand that exclusively translated hymns be sung in English services. For one thing, translating a hymn is one of the very most difficult tasks. It is not everyone's cup of tea to translate Lutheran hymns into English. Often too much is lost of the content and also of the form. Prof. H. E. Jacobs rightly says: "The difference in the structure of the languages stands in the way of idiomatic translations." *(Luth. Church Review,* 41, 215.) We have very good translations, but also quite mediocre translations. Often in translation the hymns do not remain true hymns, are not hymns in the true sense of the word, and as a result are not sung so readily, or some of the content is lost in translation that should not be lost. Compare, for example, the two translations of the tremendous, poignant Passion hymn, "O Lamb of God Innocent." In our little *Lutheran Hymnal* it reads (No. 48):

> O Lamb of God most holy, Who on the
> cross didst languish. E'er patient, meek, and
> lowly, Though mocked amid Thine anguish.

There the strong, I would almost say the Bible and confessional expression "slaughtered" is rendered with the languish. In our *Ev. Luth. Hymn-Book there* is a more literal, but also significantly more cumbersome translation (No. 803):

> O Lamb of God most holy, Upon the cursed
> tree slain; E'er patient, meek, and lowly,
> Though heaped with hate and disdain.

Or compare the very subjective, but highly poetic: "How well I feel, O friend of souls, when I rest in your love,

with the English translation (No. 109):

> O Friend of souls, how blest am I Whene'er Thy love my spirit calms!

How much smoother sounds the Passion Song of Jsaac Watts (No. 204): When I survey the wondrous cross, On which the King of Glory died, My richest gain I count but loss And pour contempt on all my pride,,

or Ray Palmer's song (No. 351):

> My faith looks up to Thee, Thou Lamb of Calvary, Savior divine.

In addition, we would not be doing justice to our missionary task in this country if only foreign songs were sung in our English services. And there are also quite a number of English songs that we can and should use quite well in worship and in school.

Therefore, this must be the goal for church and school: to translate the Lutheran hymns, especially the true great hymns, into English, the text and especially the melody. And by this I mean not only, although primarily, the German Lutheran *hymns,* but also the Lutheran *hymns of* the Scandinavian and other churches, which up to now have been used far too little, especially in our *Lutheran Hymn Book*.

Prof. Hult, in the article already quoted, says: "A thousand times rather a somewhat clumsy translation, *for a while*, of Lutheran hymns than a wholesale surrender to the Reformed Church." And then the best, but really only the very best English hymns eiybürgern in our English-becoming congregations and schools, and with the best tunes ;-). But there Prof. August Pieper's

1) Our German hymnal also contains songs by non-Lutheran poets, such as the Reformed Joachim Neander's "Lobe den HErren, den mächtigen König der Ehren" and the three songs of J. Scheffler (Angelus Silesius), who converted to the Roman Church: "Die Seele Christi heil'ge mich", "JEsu, komm doch selbst zu mir" and "Mir nach! spricht Christus, unser Held".

A somewhat paradoxical saying: Now that we are becoming English, we must first and foremost become German, that is, form the judgment and taste for German songs and melodies and then select the English ones. In view of the importance of the matter, it is not a superfluous task for pastors and teachers to work together.

A brief overview of the course and development of English hymnody may now help us to do this. As we distinguish three periods in the history of German hymnody, viz. the first period, from 1625 to 1675, in two sections of seventy-five years each: 1525 to 1600 and 1600 to 1675 (the formation of the hymn); the second period, from 1700 to 1800 (the formation), the third period, from 1800 onward (the renewal), so also in the history of English hymnody three periods may be distinguished: the first period, from 1550 to 1700; the second period, from 1700 to 1800; the third period, from 1800 to the present. In the first period, from 1550 to 1700, psalms were metrically transcribed; only psalms were sung. In the second period, from 1700 to 1800, free songs, hymns, began to be written and used on an extensive scale, notably in the circles of the Dissenters or Nonconformists, that is, outside the Episcopal State Church of England and the Presbyterian State Church of Scotland; psalms and songs (hymns) were sung. In the third period, from 1800 to the present, what is known as hymn-singing, free song poetry, appeared in all branches of English Protestantism, and what are known as hymn-books, free song collections, were adopted. Songs were sung.

So the first period, from 1550 to 1700, is when the Psalms were metrically edited and universally sung. The English church had, of course, sung before that, even Lutheran songs. The Bible translator Miles Coverdale, who had taken Luther as his model for translating the Bible, also published a number of Luther songs in English under the title, which sounds somewhat strange to us, *Ghostly Psalmes and Spiritual Songs* (Psalm
men, Latin songs, and fifteen other songs). But unfortunately, the whole Lutheran movement in England soon perished, and with it the small beginning of an English Lutheran hymn. The real beginning of the history of English hymnody falls in the year 1549, when some forty psalms appeared in metrical translation by Thomas Sternhold. That was the beginning of the so-called *Old Version of the Psalter,* The meter was constructed according to the so-called syllable scheme: 8, 6, 8, 6, in loud iambs with a rhyme between the second and fourth line, the so-called common meter, as it was soon called and is still called today, the meter that we also have in the German melodies "Nun

danket all' und bringet Ehr", "Lobt Gott, ihr Christen allzugleich", "Nun sich der Tag geendet hat" etc. On this basis further work was then done; soon two complete metrical arrangements appeared, one in England, the Psalter of Sternhold and Hopkins, the other in Scotland. The so-called *English Psalter*, or *The Old Version,* held its own for over a century, and has exerted the greatest influence, though the Scottish translation was essentially better in formal respects. Now both are really only of historical, not practical, interest.

It took about a century for the Westminster Assembly of Divines, famous in church history, to be held under Charles I.
took place, and among the work it undertook was a new metrical translation of the Psalter. The work was assigned to a committee - Francis Rous was the head and leader of it - and out of it came the *Scottish Psalter,* so called because it gained sole authority in the Scottish Church in 1650, and is still held in esteem there. This *Scottish Psalter* was also widely adopted by the English Puritans and came to America with the English and Scottish immigrants. In general, it can be said that it was a vigorous, stout, but also somewhat monotonous metrical rendering of the literal sense of the psalms, in keeping with Scottish ecclesiastical peculiarities.

The third moment in this first period of the history of the English hymn is then that of Täte and Bradh, which appeared in 1696. Täte was the Poet Laureate at that time, and Brady was the Court Chaplain to the English King William III. This is now the so-called "new version," as it was soon quite naturally and justly called, and is still called. It also embraces the whole Psalter; but while the two editions hitherto mentioned, the *English Psalter* and the *Scottish Psalter,*
metrical translations, Täte and Bradh's was more of a metrical paraphrase. The translators sought a richer, more varied poetic form, took the thoughts as they understood them, but did not bind themselves so strictly to the words, and thus formed more elegant, to be sure, but, also much freer and expanded verses. Consequently arose a rather violent Hymnological! This dispute lasted for decades, and only slowly did Tate and Bradh's *Psalter* break through, but it was undoubtedly the reason why free hymnody soon arose and also found recognition and acceptance in public worship. Until about the middle of the nineteenth century, quite a number of these old psalm settings were found in the common English and American hymnals. Now they have mostly disappeared from them here in America. Exceptions are

at most Rous' 42nd Psalm: "As Pants the Hart for Cooling Streams" and a few others. The United Presbyterians, however, whose theological Xenia Seminary is now here in St. Louis, still sing only metrical psalms, not songs composed by men. Only a few free English songs were composed in this first period, one or two of which can be found in our *Ev. Luth. Hymn-Book*, namely the old, well-known doxology: "Praise God, from whom All Blessings Flow" by Bishop Thomas Ken, originally the last verse of his morning h*ymn* No. 29 "Awake, My Soul, and with the Sun", and of his evening hymn "All Praise to Thee, My God, This Night".

Then, with the year 1700 or thereabouts, the second period of English hymnody begins. This is connected with the growth and spread of the Dissenters or Nonconformists, i.e. those who did not agree with the state church, the Established Church, but deviated from it, and the characteristic of this period is the free song writing, especially in the circles of the Dissenters. In the years 1707 to 1709, Isaac Watts, the pastor of a large Independent or Congregationalist church in London, published his important, much-named work, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*.
hymnal that did not consist of versified psalms and yet was intended for public worship. Watts explicitly declared himself against the exclusive use of the Psalms because the Psalter was a Jewish and not a Christian book. Many of these from it, however, were paraphrases of biblical passages, but their intention was not to reproduce the text of the Bible, but to induce free expression in congregational singing. With the appearance of these *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* a new period really began, and Watts is usually called "the father of English hymnody." His manner, however, was often dry and lacking in verve-he never approached a Paul Gerhardt or Johann Heermann or Philipp Nicolai-but neither can he be denied real poetic feeling; he had a vigorous and expressive English, and on the whole expressed Christian cenial truths. Of the 350 songs which his work contained, about 100 are still more or less in use. Our *Ev. Lutheran Hymn-Book* also contains some, e.g., No. 204: "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross." Later, Watts also edited a number of psalms, but followed an entirely new way of doing so. He did not versify all the psalms, did not always use the whole psalm, and did not follow the wording closely, so that one often does not immediately recognize that his song is based on a psalm. No. 78: "Before Jehovah's Awful Throne", that is the 100th Psalm: "Rejoice in the Lord, all the earth", belongs to this; furthermore

No. 483: "Jesus Shall Reign Where'er the Sun"; which is the 72nd Psalm, "God, give thy judgment to the king, and thy righteousness to the king's son," and especially the hymn which in England is sung with pleasure to this day on such occasions, especially at the coronation of kings in Westminster Abbey, No. 172, "O God, Our Help in Ages Past," which is the 90th Psalm, "O Lord God, thou art our refuge for ever and ever."

Watts was soon followed by Philip Doddridge, still in the first half of the eighteenth century, to whom smooth poetry is not to be denied, though the communion *hymn* in our *Hymn-Book*, No. 429: "My God, and Is Thy Table Spread," is at any rate Reformed is meant. And, in general, Watts had quite a number of disciples in the eighteenth century who walked in his footsteps. But this is not true of the man who excels Watts as a poet, and who now marks a new step in the history of English hymnody, Charles Wesley, the brother of John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, and his brother's lifelong associate in the free evangelism which attaches itself to John Wesley's name. About forty years Charles Wesley was active in our field, from 1739 to 1780, and composed almost inordinate amounts of poetry. The number of his songs amounts to about 6500, and about 500 of them have long been used in church, and are to a great extent still in use. Wesley differs from Watts once in greater variety of form. Watts observed the old iambic forms, and his songs could therefore only be sung to a few traditional tunes. Wesley also wrote in trochaic meters; the result was that folk melodies were adapted to the songs or new melodies were found. Then Wesley is much fresher and more poetic in his songs. Watts is more teacher, Wesley more poet. And above all - and this was fatal to English hymnody - Wesley is thoroughly subjective in his songs. The objective character which makes the Lutheran hymn the great, strong congregational song it really is, is almost entirely lacking in Wesley's songs. His conception of the hymn is that it is the expression of one's own personal, subjective feeling and experience. The songs of this Methodist are, to put it in a word, precisely Methodist: every Christian must have had essentially the same experiences, if he is really converted, must also be able to state the time and hour of his conversion. We can well understand from the historical point of view that Wesley's songs were joyfully welcomed and gladly sung, even outside Methodist circles. They helped the spread of Methodism almost as much as Charles Wesley's own and his brother John Wesley's sermons. But certainly there is a weakness in this

of English hymnody, which has only been partially overcome. Nevertheless, it can be said that we have a number of songs by Charles Wesley in our *Hymn-Book, which* belong to the good English songs, e.g. No. 164: "Hark! the Herald Angels Sing"; Sir. 221: "Christ the Lord is Ris'n To-day", also the somewhat very subjective and not denying its history of origin, but nevertheless also quite gloriously praising the divine grace and Christ's merit "Jesus, Lover of My Soul",No. 107.2) Incidentally, John Wesley, who was converted by Luther's powerful preface to the Epistle to Rome, also has merits for the English *hymnal,* firstly by having translated a number of core Lutheran *hymns* into English, e.g. Paul Gerhardt's "Befiehl du deine Wege", and secondly by having published the first *Methodist hymnal in the* year 1780, the "*Hymnal"*.
basis of all Methodist hymn-books, and finally also by criticizing his brother Charles' fruitful and therefore in value sinking poetic activity.3)

But now, through Watts' and Wesley's work, a path had been created for free English hymnody. As early as 1746, even the strict Scottish church allowed songs other than psalms to be sung, and included some of them in an appendix to its *Scottish Psalter*. And soon the songs multiplied in the most diverse ecclesiastical circles, comparatively least in the main church, the Church of England. John Newton and William Cowper issued what were called *Olney Hymns in* the Episcopal Church; both were generally good poets. We still sing

2) A beautiful story is told concerning the origin of this hymn. Mr. Wesley was standing before the open window of his room one morning. He was looking out over the beautiful landscape in front of his home. As he looked, he saw a little song-bird, which was being chased by a cruel hawk. The poor bird was badly frightened and, seeing the open window, flew through it and directly into Mr. Wesley's arms. With fluttering heart and quivering wing it nestled close to the singer and escaped a cruel death in the talons of the hawk. According to the story, Mr. Wesley himself was just then having some personal trials and was feeling the need of a refuge just like the little bird which had flown into his bosom for protection. Out of this incident and his personal experience he took up his pen and produced the masterpiece of his many hymns, (W. L. Hunton, "Favorit" p. 232 f.)

3) John Wesley's Journal: "Under the date of May 14, 1738, I went very reluctantly to a society in Aldergate St. (London), where one was reading Luther's Preface to the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. About a quarter before 9 o'clock, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart by faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed; I felt that I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation, and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."

today Newton's "Glorious Things of Thee are Spoken" (No. 464), only usually not to a proper tune; likewise Cowper's "There Is a Fountain Filled with Blood" (No. 200) and No. 524: "God Moves in a Mysterious Way, His Wonders to Perform." At that time, in the second half of the eighteenth century, the Baptist Anne Steele also sang her songs, the first significant songwriter among the many women prominent in the history of English hymnody. Augustus Toplady composed his imperishable "Rock of Ages, Cleft for Me," No. 325, perhaps the best-known English hymn, again expressing the central Christian truths; Williams his spirited song of sanctification, No. 340: "Guide Me, O Thou Great Jehovah;" and Perronnet his song of worship and homage to the Savior, No. 93: "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name."

Thus we come to the third and final period in the history of English hymnody, beginning about the year 1800 and extending to the present time. If the characteristic of the second period was this, that people began to break away from the exclusive use of the metrical psalms and to compose free songs, the characteristic of this third period is this, that in all branches of English-speaking Protestantism the sacred song was cultivated. If in the second period two men, Watts and Wesley, actually dominated the field and produced the great majority of the songs then sung, from the year 1800 onwards a great number of song writers appear, and one collection of songs follows another. If poverty prevailed before, now almost a fatal wealth arises. At the same time, on the one hand, a significant progress can be observed in this period of song poetry, especially in the first third of the century, and on the other hand, of course, a regrettable regression. Several points of the development are to be particularly considered. First, with the nineteenth century the Church of England, the Episcopal Church, comes to the fore and, as it were, takes the lead. This was an advance; for the Episcopal Church, though Reformed, is after all a so-called liturgical Church. And the leaders were in part excellent men. This soon shows itself in the character of the songs. The songs now become more accomplished in form, more sonorous in tone, more dignified in content, also more objective in expression. At the top are the two Episcopalians Reginald Heber and John Keble. Heber composed but few songs, but some of these are among the most accomplished and very best, e.g., No. 263: "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty," one of the maje
most stately songs in praise of the Holy Trinity; also the beautiful Epiphany song, No. 181: "Brightest and Best of the Sons of the Morning." Keble again leaves somewhat the strict hymn form, but his Evensong, No. 42: "Sun of My Soul, Thou

Savior Dear", is one of the best known, if not the best known and most popular English Evensong, and his song collection *The Christian Year* has become one of the most popular poetic collections in any language. Keble was at once an ecclesiastical figure. With Pusey and Newman he was one of the leaders of what was called the "Oxford Movement," the high church direction in the English state church, flirting with Rome, the Ritualistic or High Church party; but he did not actually convert to the Roman Church as did his friend and fellow-member, the later Cardinal John Henry Newman, who was also a hymn writer, and whose "Lead, Kindly Light" is much praised and sung. Who in this song, which does not even mention the name of JEsu, clearly expresses the insecure, uncertain, vague theological position of the man, which finally drove him into the arms of the Roman Church, and there made him so superstitious that he feared to be in a dark room. The other tendency in the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical ober Low Church party, was also active in the field of hymnody, and so it came about that the whole tone and character of English hymnody was considerably enlarged and elevated, as much in a poetical as in an ecclesiastical sense. There Robert Grant sings the hymn No. 213: "Savior, When in Dust to Thee," really a free arrangement of the early church litany; the richly gifted Henry Francis Lyte poets his heartfelt and perfectly formed "Abide with Me, Fast Falls the Eventide," No. 40; a little later W. C. Dix his Epiphany hymn, No. 183: "As with Gladness Men of Old," and S. J. Stone his song of the church, No. 466: "The Church's One Foundation." And soon, in 1861, there also appeared by far the best known of all Anglican Episcopal hymnals, *Hymns Ancient and Modern,* for
which was chiefly the work of H. W. Baker, and which found its way into all parts of the world.

Secondly, the fact that the Anglican Church in a sense took the lead in hymnody created a new important factor for it. The Episcopal Church believes itself to be especially bound to the early Christian Church through the so-called historical episcopate, and also, as a result of the emphasis on its concept of the Church, has a special interest in the early Church institutions and customs, also in the song treasury of the early Church, and in general in the songs of other times and other languages. The consequence of this was the many translations of hymns from other languages. Particularly as a result of the Oxford Movement, attention was focused on the hymns of the ancient Latin and ancient Greek churches. As a result, the English song treasury received a significant and, in many respects, a good enrichment. And among the numerous translators, John Mason Neale stands out particularly since 1835, who not only tirelessly researched the ancient sources, but also

He knew how to render beautiful songs of the ancient and medieval church in an excellent way in the English idiom. To him we owe, for example, No. 550: "Jerusalem the Golden"; that is the Old Latin *Urbs Zion Aurea.* And Neale was joined by others, including two Catholics,
Caswell and Faber. From Caswell we have No. 98: "Jesus, the Very Thought of Thee"; which is the old, beautiful *Jesu, Dulcis Memoria of* Bernard of Clairvaux, which, also the Lutheran Martin Moller has so well rendered: "O JEsu sweet, who remembers Thee." The same origin has No. 90: "O Jesus, King Most Wonderful." And to this class belongs the harrowing "Day of Wrath, That Day of Mourning," No. 555, the *Dies Irae, Dies Illa* of Thomas of Celano, and the pearl of popular carols, "Come Hither, Ye Faithful," the Latin *Adeste, Fideles.* And as the Latin carols were studied and translated into English, so were soon the German hymns especially eagerly, which, after all, were naturally much closer to the English Church. There, too, many were active: Miss Cox, Miss Borthwick, and others; but the palm belongs to the Episcopalian Catherine Winkworth, who in her *Lyra Germanica* and in her *Chorale Book for England* opened up the richness and glory of Lutheran hymnody to the English Church. Songs like "Lift Up Your Heads, Ye Mighty Gates," No. 188, "Now Thank We All Our God," No. 64, and others more read almost like originals. It may be said that for every time of the church year, for every situation in Christian life, there is at least one genuine Lutheran hymn in good, often exemplary translation. Thus really the Episcopal Church has been of great importance to English hymnody in the nineteenth century. Other outstanding poets were really only the Herrnhuter James Montgomery with his well-known Christmas hymn, No. 187: "Angels from the Realms of Glory," the Presbyterian H. C. Bonar with his "I Heard the Voice of Jesus Say," the Independents Kelly and Couder, the Dissenter Reed with his Pentecostal hymn, No. 259: "Holy Ghost, with Light Divine," the Unitarian Bow
ring with his "In the Cross of Christ I Glory," No. 95, and among the numerous female poets Mrs. Mackay with her beautiful funeral song, "Asleep in Jesus, Blessed Sleep," No. 540, and notably Charlotte Elliott with her justification song, "Just as I Am, without One Plea," No. 318, which will also remain as long as English is sung.

Thirdly. Unfortunately, however, the nineteenth century also saw a regression in the development of English hymnody. Songs began to be written for special people and for special purposes, and so the missionary and Sunday-school hymns came into being. This was connected with the missionary movement and the Sunday-school movement of the nineteenth century, which took place largely in England, where the great missionary societies were soon established.

The English hymn lost a good part of its more correct form. Thus the English hymn lost a good part of its more correct form. The songs which were not actually composed for the congregation, but for certain circles in the congregation, again became more subjective, more sentimental, more reformed. To this genre belong Thomas Kelley, J. Montgomery with No. 132: "Hail to the Lord's Anointed," and as one of the most fruitful James Edmeston with his much-sung, but by no means exemplary, "Savior, Breathe an Evening Blessing," No. 37; further Baring-Gould with the "Onward, Christian Soldiers," used on all sorts of occasions. And even R. Heber steers in this direction with the mission song "From Greenland's Icy Mountains," No. 474, so that a few years ago at the great triennial meeting of the Episcopal Church of our country this song was almost eliminated from the Episcopal hymnal.

Finally, let us take a look at English hymnody in America. It has already been noted that the English-speaking churches of America first followed in the footsteps of the English and Scottish churches. Psalms were sung first, and later the songs of Watts and Wesley. Who also in America a more independent movement showed itself in the nineteenth century. Timothy Dwight sang the well-known hymn of the church, No. 468: "I Love Thy Zion, Lord," Ray Palmer the good, much-sung hymn, No. 351: "My Faith Looks Up to Thee." From the American Alexander we have probably the best rendering of the imperishable Passion hymn, "O Head Full of Blood and Wounds": "O Sacred Head, Now Wounded" (in our *Hymn-Book* there is a somewhat different translation, No. 201: "O Bleeding Head and Wounded"). S. D. Phelps wrote the likewise much-sung "Savior, Thy Dying Love," No. 353, which admittedly reminds us strongly of Zinzendorff's word: "That did I for thee, what doest thou for me?" And so more contributions by American poets could be named.

But unfortunately, even in America in the nineteenth century, a regression took place which must not go unmentioned. Especially through the evangelistic activity of Moody, the so-called gospel hymns or revival hymns appeared. It is fair to say that for the outward success of this revivalism the singer Sankey did just as much as the preacher Moody. And this movement was disastrous. Songs were composed and sung which fell easily on the ear and in the memory, which were more reminiscent of alley songs, and really did great harm to the church. In some circles they exposed the Church and Christianity to ridicule and contempt. Everyone knows them, the often downright paltry songs, or can easily find them in one of the collections still in use today, which are only too often found in our Christian houses,

look up "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere," "Let a Little Sunshine in," etc. They contain, as has been quite properly said, usually very little gospel, and still less music. Quite correctly says of these gospel-hymns Prof. W. L. Pratt, of Hartford Theological Seminary, "The mass of them, being produced in a more or less commercial way and with merely jingling dexterity, are commonplace, sometimes vulgar."

But it must not be forgotten in this brief historical overview that the Lutheran Church in America has also intervened somewhat in this matter. W. A. Mühlenberg, descended from the so-called "Patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America," composed the beautiful death song No. 535: "I Would Not Live Away"; J. A. Seiß added a fourth verse to Newman's song "Lead, Kindly Light," which does not mention Jesus' name, and thus "improved and corrected" it to some extent in a Christian way:

> Till then, along the path Thyself hast trod, Jesus, lead on;
> Be Thou my Strength, my Help, O Son of God, Till heav'n is won,
> Till with Thy folded flock my soul shall rest In that calm peace where all Thy saints are blest.

H. E. Jacobs has somewhat remedied the sensitive lack of grace hymns peculiar to the Reformed Church, and very explicable in it, by his good "Nearer, My God, to Thee!", No. 324. Thro' Word and Sacrament, Thou Com'st to Me," No. 324. (The Unitarian Sarah Adams' "Nearer, My God, to Thee," so extraordinarily prevalent, has also been re-penned and improved by H.D. Gänse, and should be learned and sung among us in that version alone, No. 520.) M. Loy has composed English Lutheran hymns. Our recently blessedly departed August Crull has rendered much service by good translations. And there are signs that just at the present time the Lutheran Church in America is beginning to realize what it lacks in regard to English hymnody and is anxious to remedy the situation.

After this historical overview, which is limited by the shortness of time, let us return to our starting point. It is an important and at the same time a beautiful, high task for the future of our church that we pastors and teachers (and the teachers also in their profession as organists) work together and properly cultivate the Lutheran congregational and confessional song. Our director Kohn recently warned somewhere in our "Schulblatt" that we pastors and teachers should not read ourselves out of the Lutheran church after all. This warning is not superfluous. But let us also see to it that we do not sing ourselves out of the Lutheran Church. Even this warning is not unnecessary in some places. When Lutheran pro-

When Lutheran professors are inducted into office, it is certainly appropriate that Lutheran hymns be sung; but it has twice happened that the English hymns chosen for the occasion were of Reformed origin. If ever, the Lutheran chorale must find its place at the Reformation feast; but we have twice observed that, besides "Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott," "Onward, Christian Soldiers" and "Stand Up, Stand Up for Jesus," Reformed hymns, which are not even to be found, and rightly so, in our hymnal, were heard. And a good, ecclesiastical melody is connected with the lyrics (unfortunately we cannot go into more detail on this point now), so that our English services are also beautifully and worthily arranged on this side, and the Psalm word applies to all: "It stands glorious and splendid before him [the Lord], and is done mightily and praiseworthily in his sanctuary," Ps. 96:6.

L. F.

Literature.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo, has published:

Tiny Tots' Bible Pictures. 12 cards; 10 cts. - *Concordia Primary Leaflets.* Published every eight weeks; 30 cts. <- *Junior Department.* Published quarterly; 30 cts. - *Intermediate Department.* Published quarterly; 30 cts. - *Senior Department. Published quarterly*; 30 cts. - *Catechism Department.* Published quarterly; 30 cts. - *Graded Memory Course,* Primary, Junior, and Intermediate Departments; 5 cts. each - *Junior Bible Student.* Published quarterly; 50 cts. - *Concordia Teachers' Quarterly;* 75 cts.-This literature has proved itself excellently adapted for our purposes. What a blessing it will be to our Sunday-schools, too, if what is offered here can be managed even in a very makeshift way! Our publisher remarks: "We are pleased to state that our Sunday-school series, as far as its distribution is concerned, is scoring a satisfactory success. ... Now that our Missouri congregations have by their own vote established a Sunday-school Board, it is desirable - we are almost tempted to say necessary - that they support that Board in its work, not only by friendly criticism and advice, but also by using what this Board provides." F. B.

Proceedings of the 1922 Lutheran Synodical Conference. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 56 pp. 40 Cts.

In his opening sermon based on Phil. 1, 3. 5, Praeses Gausewiß refers to the fiftieth anniversary of the Synodal Conference. It says: "We know from God's Word that not every fellowship is given by God or pleases Him. . . . What about our synodical conference? Dear brethren, we know from God's holy Word that it is a fellowship given by God, in which therefore God is well pleased, and over which we, as God's children, may only rejoice. For it is founded and has stood from the first day so far in the unity of faith given by God Himself." True faith is "nothing else than confidence in God's holy Word; it relies on the Word, hangs on the Word. And where this is the case, there is unity of faith. Where, on the contrary, the word is rejected or set aside, or replaced by the wisdom of men, there is unbelief, unbelief, and superstition; and there the unity which the Holy Spirit establishes by the word is lost. If, therefore, a community of those who call themselves Christians is not in all respects founded on simple adherence to God's Word, it is not based on the unity given by God, and cannot please God. Therefore, even in spite of all opposition on the part of human beings, the following is true

prudence, and in spite of supposed advantage hoped to be derived from such fellowship for the Church, the apostle's exhortation, 'Depart from the same!' The Church stands on the Word. If she in any way leaves this firm ground, she cannot but suffer harm." "The Synodical Conference stands there as a work of God in this time of unbelief and rejection of the divine Word. God, in His marvelous grace and kindness, has so guided and sustained us from the first day thus far, that this greatest union of Lutheran synods in America still stands in unity of faith-as a God-given fellowship." "We are a confessional community. This means that we all confess the same truth of God as our faith, and that we do not speak one way and another differently, but that we all speak the same way, 1 Cor. 1:10; Jn. 8:31. This also means that we stand together and confess to one another that we stand in the unity of the faith, as Paul demands of Timothy: 'Do not be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me, who am his prisoner,' 2 Tim. 1:8. Thus the very existence of the Synodal Conference is an expression and a public confession of our fellowship in the truth of God against all error. We confess with one another and confess to one another, rejecting together what is not right with God's Word. This God-given community of faith and confession over the past fifty years has become a source of rich blessing to us. Holding together in the truth of God has strengthened us inwardly and outwardly and given us strength. In spite of all the opposition, and although we have often had to stand up for things that are not agreeable to the spirit of the times and to so-called 'public opinion,' our Synodal Conference has become a large, genuinely Lutheran American church, indeed, the most member-rich general Lutheran church body in our country." Prof. J. P. Meyer's paper deals with the fourth and fifth propositions of the exceedingly timely subject, "The Struggle for Our School System." The sentences read, "The struggle for our school system will be properly waged only if we remain vividly conscious of the fact that the Savior has called us to be His witnesses." "Because our school system is a matter of the kingdom of God, God will mightily assist us uno the camps to victory." Page 25 to 44 brings the pleasing report of Missionary Director Drewes' on the Negro Mission and the resolutions passed in this matter. God bless the Synodical Conference and its blessed work on the Negroes! F. B.

Special Problems of the Christian Day-School. By *Paul T. Buszin, C. H. Seitz, Th. Kuehnert, A. A. Grossmann,* and *Paul E. Kretzmann.* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 136 pages, 5%χ8%, $1.00.

Probably more has been said and written in our Synod in recent years about the necessity and blessing of the parochial school than ever before in the same period. Of all the questions, the school question has been the most topical. And the fruit has not been lacking. Many new schools have been founded and many existing ones enlarged and elevated. But there is still much, much to be done. After all, more than half of the students in our synod are not in parochial schools! The zeal for the schools must therefore not diminish for a long time to come, indeed, not at all until everywhere, in all parts of our country, next to every Lutheran church there is also a Lutheran parochial school and these have all climbed to the heights of expediency and efficiency appropriate to the time. We owe this not only to our children, but also to the church, our country and the whole world. To raise our schools - this book also serves this interest. It offers excellent material for lectures and will be a great blessing in the hands of our pastors, teachers and church members. The subject treated of by Bro. Buszin is, "The Status of the Christian Day-school." Father Seltz treats of "The Christian Day-school Plant and Equipment"; Teacher Grossmann, "Present-day Tendencies and Their Influence on Our Schools"; Teacher Kühnert, "Our Schools in Their Relation to Other Educational Agencies "D. Kretzmann, "The Up-to-date Christian Teacher."

It is the eighth volume of the Concordia Teachers' Library edited by D. Kretzmann which is offered here. It is a worthy companion to its predecessors. May God also bestow His blessing on this work as on every work for our schools, the higher as well as the lower! For if a truly great and lasting blessing is to come to our church, to our country, it must come through the school, the Christian church school. F. B.

Sketches from the History of the Church. By *G-. E. Hageman.* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 299 pages 7^X10^. Z3.00.

Those who are acquainted with the excellent "Lebensbilder aus der Geschichte der christlichen Kirche," by V. Krauß, have an idea of what is here offered. "The substance matter," says the publisher, "is the same as that contained in the German book." An actual translation, however, this book is not. Nor is it lacking in independent expositions, especially in the last section. What is offered is shown by the headings: The Apostolic Age; The Apostolic Fathers; The Persecutions oi the Christians; From Constantine to Julian the Apostate; Four Teachers of the Church; Islam, the Scourge of Christianity; Winifred Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans; Charles the Great; Homan Catholic Monasticism; The Crusades; The Popes of the Middle Ages; Forerunners of the Reformation; The Reform Councils of the Fifteenth Century; Dr. Martin Luther and the Reformation; The Swiss Reformation; The English Reformation; The French Reformation; The CounterReformation; Pietism and Orthodoxy; The Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, Concerning the illustrations the publisher remarks: "There are about one half a hundred, in part, quite rare woodcuts, about thirty plate engravings, and, in addition,

His Passion. Short Sermons on the Great Passion of Our Dear Savior. By *J. H. Hartenberger.* $1.75. To be obtained from Rev. J. H. Harten- berger, Red Bud, Ill. or from Concordia Publishing House.

Offered here are 28 sermons on the Passion and one sermon on Easter. The sermons of the honored author that have appeared so far have met with general acclaim. And rightly so! For they are distinguished not only by correctness of doctrine and logical sequence of thought, but also by clarity of language and simplicity of exposition. This is also true of the present sermons in English. May many hands reach for the same! F. B.

The Proof-Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary. Vol. II. By *Louis Wessel.* 155 pages, $1.60 net. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

An excellent aid for all who have to teach the Catechism. The meaning of each biblical passage quoted is precisely fixed according to text and context. The last four main passages are treated. The first volume, which appeared several years ago, contains the treatment of the first two main sections. F. B.

The Little Minister of Elderon Creek, and other stories and poems. The Good-Will Series, By *J. T. Mueller.* G. A. and E. A. Fleischer, Publishers, 106 N. La Salle. St., Chicago, Ill. $1.25. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

These fine stories of our esteemed colleague testify to no small literary skill, combined with much spirit and noble sense. No one will read them without enjoyment and spiritual benefit. May they find wide circulation! F- B.

Civil Government. Rom. 13, 1-7. Sermon delivered at St. Luke's Ev. Luth. Church, Chicago, Ill, by *Prof, E. Koehler.* To be obtained from Rev. O. C. A. Boeder, 1501 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill. 5 cts.

This excellent sermon, which is also available in German, clearly points out the difference between state and church. Therefore, we should not be satisfied that it is read by our Christians, but should also send it to other fellow citizens, politicians and state officials. For clearly in this matter most (sometimes even our presidents and governors) still do not see. This sermon will help destroy the dangerous delusion that the church has political issues to resolve and the state has religious issues to resolve. Whoever reads this sermon will also have to admit that the

paribus, provide him with the best citizens: insightful citizens who are able to draw the line between state and church sharply and therefore have a clear and correct judgment on the most important questions concerning the freedom of our country; obedient citizens who are subject to the laws of the land not for reasons of utility and selfishness, but for the sake of conscience, and therefore never resort to rebellion in order to attain their rights. "A true Christian," says the sermon, "obeys for conscience' sake, because he knows his God wants him to do so. In obeying the government, he knows he is obeying God. His patriotism, his loyalty, his obedience, is not a matter of expedience, it springs not from a selfish motive, but is a matter of conscience and springs from his love toward God. This is the type of citizenship taught in our Lutheran churches and schools. And if we had more of this type of citizens in our country, we should have less need of policemen and penitentiaries. " F. B.

Choice Morsels. Gathered by *W. G. Polack.* Publisher: R. Volkening, Holland Bldg., St. Louis, Mo. $1.50.

The subtilel reads, "Being a collection of anecdotes, illustrations, quotations, poems, and sayings for the use of the preacher, parochial school teacher, Sunday-school worker, Bible class leader, and public speakers generally. With blank pages added for memorandums of personal experiences." Even laymen will enjoy reading this book and not without benefit. And since it is full of captivating, self-contained, short thoughts that are offered here, even a few moments are enough to make it worthwhile to take it in hand. It would also be a blessing if this book were always available at home and in the office for use in those short minutes when one is otherwise unoccupied, or also for those customers or visitors whom one cannot serve immediately. In this way the book might contribute to letting rays of the beyond, thoughts of eternity, penetrate into the transitory earthly hurry and hunt. F. B.

The Church's Claim upon Men. By *Arthur Brunn.* Published by the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, 22-26 East 17th St., New York, N. Y.

This tract emphasizes the glorious issue of Christians to build and help spread the kingdom of God. "The Church," it concludes, "demands the best enthusiasm, the best devotion, the best service, the best sacrifices of which men are capable. The Church demands the largest place in our thoughts and in our devotion and in our life." F. B.

The Place of Scholarship in Ministerial Training. By *Dr. S. G. Hefellower*. Published by Carthage College, Carthage, Ill.

This lecture, delivered at a conference in Chicago, rightly advocates ever more thorough training from Lutheran seminaries. But in answering the question of how this progress is to be achieved, one will not always agree. It is interesting to note that "The Faculty of Concordia at St. Louis has produced about one-fourth of all books written by American Lutheran professors of theology in the twelve seminaries that we have considered. Without them the data at hand would enable us to report only eighteen professors as authors of between sixty-five and seventy-five books." The best books, however, that a faithful Lutheran professor writes are his students, each of whom in many cases means more to the church than even many a great literary opus. F. B.

The Lutheran Deaconess. Official organ of the Lutheran Deaconess Association within the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America. Published quarterly by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 25 cts.

This new sheet of eight pages, two of them written in German, is edited by Fr. Herzberger

According to this newspaper, there are about 40,000 deaconesses in the world, 20,000 of them in Germany. The first deaconess institution was founded by Father Fliedner in Kaiserswerth in 1836. In America, Paffavant began the work in Pittsburgh among the Lutherans in 1849. The Mary Drexel Home in Philadelphia was opened in 1888, and the Deaconess House in Milwaukee in 1891. Lutheran Deaconess Houses also exist in Baltimore, Omaha, Brooklyn, Minneapolis, Chicago, Buffalo, and St. Paul. The two institutions within the Synodical Conference are at Fort Wayne and Beaver Dam, Wis. with 15, and 3 deaconesses respectively. Deaconess houses have also been established by the Episcopalians, Methodists, etc. At St. Louis the deaconess house of the Protestants has existed since 1890. The principal article, written by Mission Director Brand, has as its subject, "The Ideal Deaconess in the Foreign Missions Field." To characterize the "right deaconess spirit" the words are quoted, "What will I do? Serve is what I want to do. Whom will I serve? The Lord in His wretched and poor. And what is my reward? I serve neither for reward nor for thanksgiving, but for thanksgiving and love. And if I should perish? "If I perish, I perish," said Queen Esther; and should I not perish for the sake of him who also 'perished' for me, who laid down his life for me? And if I grow old in the process? Then shall my heart be green as a palm tree, and the LORD shall fill me with grace and mercy. I therefore walk, fit, lie down wholly with peace, for the LORD careth for me." F. B.

The Huron Lutheran Messenger. Published monthly. Bad Axe, Mich. 35 cts.

This new leaflet, edited by P. O. G. Renner, zealously advocates the church school. Its motto is: "To preach the Gospel of Christ Crucified to sinners; to instruct the young according to divine precept; to cultivate the spirit of true Christian fellowship; to help extend the kingdom of Christ everywhere." Luther's words are also quoted, among others: "God's word is preserved for us and our descendants especially by preserving good schools and educating the young." F. B.

Lutheran Charities. Published monthly by the Lutheran Charities Association of St. Louis, Mo. 50 cts. per annum. Order from Rev. P. M. Dautenhahn, Bus. Mgr, 3735 Iowa Ave, St. Louis, Mo.

What the "Kranken- und Waisensreund" has been and still is for German readers, this new paper now wants to offer to English readers as well. It wants to serve primarily the orphanage in Des Peres and our hospital and old people's home in St. LoUis. As is well known, the orphanage as well as the hospital was founded by Father J. F. Bünger, the hospital in 1861, the orphanage in 1867. 106 children are presently in the latter. Since its foundation it has housed 1315 children. Of these, 94 children have been baptized, 423 confirmed, and 32 children and 9 old people (at first the orphanage also served as a home for the aged) buried. Our hospital, which at present is up to date in every respect, has room for 100 sick people. The Nurses' Home, built in 1922, has room for 55 nurses. Fr. A. P. Feddersen is the editor of the new paper, to whom we also wish God's rich blessing. F. B.

SGod--or Gorilla. By *Alfred Watterson McCann.* The Devin-Adair Co.

What is offered in this writing from 368 pages gives the Subtle!

"How the Monkey Theory of Evolution exposes its own methods, refutes its own principles, denies its own inferences, disproves its own case." The title *God-or Gorilla* sounds crude, but it expresses the truth that the consistent evolutionist must substitute the ape for God, who created man in his own image. The case against Darwinism is everywhere as logically stringent as it is literarily riveting. Especially the ape theory is duly pilloried in all its mendacity and wretchedness.

However, the author (a Catholic) does little harm to the good cause by trying to exploit his fight against Darwinism against Protestantism. On page 321 we read: "For a time Protestantism

seemed to be doomed by the new Darwinism. Catholic faith suffered less, for it was based on the writings of the early Fathers and on tradition, as well as on the Bible [?], but Protestants held that the Scriptures constituted their sole rule of faith and their sole guide of conduct. Hence, when scientific theories, 'evidence,' 'demonstrations,' seemed to 'prove' that the Bible was a mad jumble of errors, the Protestant conception of religion received a terrific shock."

As if the "Fathers" could keep their heads above water if the Scriptures were to perish! Christianity and the Church stand and fall with the Scriptures, if not the Papal Church, then at least the Christian Church, even the Catholic Church, if it is still Christian. It is also a fact that it is precisely the right position on the Bible that has so far kept the Lutheran Church of America immune to the evolutionist delusion. And the main reason why there are so many evolutionists in the sectarian churches of our country is that they are all innately rationalistic and subject the Bible to the judgment of their own reason, just as the Romans subject the Holy Scriptures to the foreign reason of the Pope. It is not because of the doctrine of evolution that the sects have been misled about the Bible in the first place, but because they place their own reason above God's Word, therefore they have also become a victim of the evolutionist foolishness. The same is true of the errors of the Roman Church. They all have their reason in that the Pope exalts himself above the Scriptures, and his followers follow him in it. The driving interest in this is, of course, the maintenance of papal power. For if the pope wanted to accept the Scriptures, he would have to give up himself.

To what extent, by the way, also the Romans make concessions to evolutionism, McCann, among others, thus lets himself be heard about: "As regards the Catholic Church, every Catholic is as free as the wind to follow scientific facts wherever they may lead, either into evolution or out of it. Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Aeterni Patrie,* August 4, 1879, clearly defined the attitude of the Catholic Church toward evolution: 'We declare that every wise thought and every useful discovery, wherever it may come from, should be gladly and gratefully welcomed.' " gerner: "It may startle the average individual to learn that out of the Catholic Church itself came the idea of evolution - not during the last century of Darwin, Haeckel, Huxley, Spencer, etc., but fourteen centuries ago. "As such representatives of evolution, of course theistic, McCann names: Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Suarez and others.

McCann also cites the pronouncements of modern Catholic writers. Joseph Hussline, in *Evolution and Social Progress* (p. 97), writes: "It is an old theory within the Church that the act of creation took place at once, and that what followed was but an evolution according to the laws that God had given." Sir Bertram Wimble says in *A Century of Scientific Thought* (p. 8): "The language of Peter Lombard and of St. Thomas Aquinas makes it clear that the teaching of St. Augustine is quite consonant with any reasonable theory of evolution - nay, it is broad and comprehensive enough to provide not only for whatever limited degree of evolution is yet fairly established, but even for anything that has even a remote probability of being proved in the future."

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* is also quoted at last, as follows: "In what particular manner the plant and animal kingdoms received their existence, whether all species were created simultaneously or a few only, which were destined to give life to others; whether only one fruitful seed was placed in Mother Earth, which under the influence of natural causes developed into the first plants, and another, infused into the waters, gave birth to the first animals, - all this the Book of Genesis leaves to our own investigation and to the revelations of science, if indeed science is able to give a final and unquestionable decision."

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

From the Synod. In "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) we again call attention to the famine that is raging in Germany. Our pastors and congregations, through the ministry of our Relief Committee, are now in possession of documents which show that millions of people are facing starvation if help is not soon forthcoming from other countries. Our congregations have just raised between three and four million dollars for our educational institutions. But this has not exhausted our earthly resources to such an extent that we cannot feed people who are threatened with starvation. Here again we recall the example of our Synodal Fathers, to which we referred a few weeks ago in a letter to our Board for Relief in Europe. "Not long after our fathers came (1839) to this country, news came that there was a famine in Ireland. Immediately, though still very poor themselves, they took up a collection for the starving Irish. They did the same when, a few years later, the city of Hamburg was stricken by the great fire disaster." We have read about this in the old minute book of the local Trinity congregation itself. In order to invite a general participation in the synodal collection for Germany, the local congregation "Zum Heiligen Kreuz" sent extra envelopes to all its members. We have heard from other congregations that the general synodal collection is warmly welcomed, especially by those who have regularly supported relatives and acquaintances for several years. They say that the food on their own table would not taste good if they were not willing to share their bread with those who are staring starvation in the face. As they are rich in all things, in faith, and in word, and in knowledge, and in all diligence, so they desire to be rich also in this benefit. - During the past year we have received several applications for admission to our St. Louis Theological Seminary from abroad. We would like to make two things publicly known here: 1. The course of study in our St. Louis institution presupposes a previous classical education, that is, knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages. In addition, we presuppose such an acquaintance with the Hebrew language that Old Testament exegesis can be carried out on the basis of the original text. We are bilingual in our theological teaching. The lectures are divided about half between the German and the English language. Therefore, we are not able to offer full instruction in all theological disciplines to those students who know only German. The faculty has initially agreed to refer all applicants who understand only the German language to the theological seminary in Berlin-Zehlendorf, unless there are special circumstances. Berlin-Zehlendorf coincides substantially with the course of study at the St. Louis Institution. F. P.

The meeting of the "General" School and Sunday School Boards was held in January at River Forest, III. In the report we read, "In our opinion the pupils of the day-school do not belong in the

Sunday-school, for the following reasons: 1. The Sunday-school is a mission institution for such children as, for the time being, cannot be gained for the day-school. 2. The pupils of the day-school receive the necessary instruction in their school, and from trained teachers at that. 3. it is an undermining of the Church to accustom children to attend the Sunday-school and then to go home and not to attend church. 4. If all children are made to attend the Sunday-school, then Sunday-school and the weekday school are placed on an equal footing, and when it has been brought about that our people regard both institutions as of equal importance, the week-day school will have received a mortal blow. We advise, therefore, that the Sunday-school Board represent above-mentioned standpoint publicly and forcefully. - After a lengthy discussion, this matter was tabled for further discussion and eventual disposition in a later meeting." No decision was reached with regard to the following recommendations: "1. On account of the grave situation that the majority of our children of school-age are trained in the public school, it is necessary that an increasing percentage of our pastors teach school, even under the present-day increased demands on the part of the state. 2. this implies that theological seminaries extend their pedagogical courses to meet the requirements. 3. arrangements should be made at once to give theological students a practical school-training in addition to their theoretical training in pedagogy. And we would like to suggest that to this end the necessary arrangements be made; perhaps in this way, that practical schoolmen be asked to lecture to the students. 4. As soon as it can be done, the theological seminaries should receive a special professorship for the pedagogical work." F. B.

The "Walther League Messenger" has increased its readership from 20,000 to 30,000 by the last drive. Again proof of what, with God's help, our young Lutherans can do when, as in the Walther League, they stand firmly together, all united and pulling at the same rope in every undertaking. Even a heavy load can be lifted and carried when many join forces at the same moment. To the success without doubt the excellent contents as well as the appealing illustrations of the *Messenger have contributed* much.

contributed. From the very beginning the *Messenger* has proved itself a faithful, chivalrous squire of our synodal papers. The times demand this, for the world, even the Lutheran world in part, is against us. If we do not want to perish, we must stand together. F. B.

Lutheran Education Society, New York, Bulletin No. 56, advocates the establishment of a magazine for higher education, among other reasons, with the following justification: "Suppose we had a magazine for the purpose of fostering the educational ideal within Synod - what a help it would be for our schools! Experimentation with a new curriculum is going on to-day in many schools. No school knows exactly what the other is doing. Synod desires exchange of ideas on the subject. A conference of professors meets - every three years. Outside of that there is no contact between the schools. We need a monthly magazine in order to develop and discuss and exchange ideas as to school curriculum. Suppose we had a magazine; it would be a great stimulus to the professors. The work demanded of an instructor in a Junior College can readily be mastered in a few years. There must be additional stimulus. Universities judge their men by their

publications. To-day a Missouri Synod professor could not find a magazine in Synod to publish an article in the field of science and mathematics, literature, history, philology, and other subjects. Synod loses this stimulus for further work and the laboratories of its professors in their special fields." F. B.

Söderblom and the Augustana Synod. In the January issue of the *Bible Banner* (organ of the Lutheran Bible Institute in St. Paul), Adolf Hult, professor at Augustana Seminary, warns with great seriousness against Soederblom's liberalism. At the conclusion of his article it says: "The press of our synod stands alone in praise of Soederblom, well-nigh. The editors of the *Lutheran, of the* Norwegian Lutheran papers, of the Ohio Synod papers, of the Iowa Synod papers, of the Missourian papers, all have boldly and repeatedly refuted the liberalism of Soederblom. But our Augustana Synod keeps on in a chorus of rapt praise. Shall our synod be the door to rationalism in the American Lutheran Church? I wish I could print the masses of personal letters I have before me from leading Lutherans of other synods as to this question. It would shock our Christian laymen. God waken us in time, - and, in fact, I fear that only a great spiritual awakening can rescue us. God grant such a refreshing! A hopeful visible sign is the fact that the young candidates for the ministry are in most cases alive to the situation. We shall not spare any labor, prayer, and teaching to deepen that sense among them. Hallesby, Soederblom's mightiest opponent in the Scandinavian lands, said during his visit that he deemed Soederblom the most dangerous man of the Lutheran Church. I told Dr. Hallesby personally that this had been my own conviction for years. He is most dangerous because he is the most skilful evader of the issue in all Protestantism, as I lately wrote in a letter to Prof. Machen of Princeton University. . . Oh, what heartaches, what prayer, what searching of the Word before our synod will be cleansed of this stain upon her creedal rectitude and her submission to the saving Word of God! History, alas, never forgets." By fraternizing with Söderblom, and by the praises bestowed upon this aberration, especially in the *Lutheran Companion*, the leaders of the Augustana Synod have given their Lutheranism a black eye. Should they themselves already be infected by liberalism? Among Anglicans, Reformed, and sects, Söderblom is held in high esteem, and especially among the liberals in Germany: Hirsch, Heitmüller, Hölscher, Titius, Wobbermin, the editors of the liberal "Theologische Literaturzeitung" (1923, sp. 646). "Tell me with whom you associate, and I will tell you who you are."

F. B.

Söderblom at Mount Airy. *The Philadelphia Seminary Bulletin* be
The "Church of Sweden", in its December issue of last year, states: "On Thursday, November 15, the seminary had the honor of entertaining the Most Reverend Nathan Soederblom, Archbishop of Upsala and Primate of the Church in Sweden. Arrangements for the visit had been made during the summer by representatives of the seminary who attended the World Convention in Eisenach. It had been announced that the archbishop would speak on the subject of 'Evangelic Catholicity,' and the invitations which had been issued brought together an audience which filled the Schaeffer-Ashmead Memorial Church. In a brief address of welcome the president of the seminary spoke of the

relations which had existed between the Lutherans of Pennsylvania and the Church of Sweden in colonial times. Dr. E. Clarence Miller, president of the board, then introduced to the audience the seminary's distinguished guest" In his speech Söderblom kept his free views behind the mountains. The speech bears witness to the well-known skill with which liberals everywhere know how to use language to conceal their thoughts and secret doctrines as much as possible. Söderblom distinguished the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, and the Evangelical Catholic Church, to which latter all Reformed and Protestants also belong. "Evangelic catholicity," said Söderblom in terms of his theory of development, "is an authentic continuation of the Western Church, as genuine and as authentic as Roman Christianity. The Reformation was a movement of progress from medieval Christianity, which is not to be regarded as a mere parenthesis in Christian history." The 16th century, he said, created three new types of piety: Luther's, Loyola's, and Erasmus's. Which of these took the straightest path depended on where one placed the centre of medieval Christianity. For those who find it in faith in God's mercy, the Lutheran Church is the true continuation of the medieval church. Literally, "Those who place it in [the] moral aim, in the observance of the Law and the Gospel, will prefer the type of Erasmus and the Oxford Reformers; those who place it in the hierarchical institution will prefer the type of Loyola; those who place it in God's undeserved mercy will see in the Lutheran the true continuation of the medieval Church, with the fulfillment of Paulinism and Augustinianism." It sounded quite orthodox and Missourian when Söderblom then went on to declare that Protestant Catholicism must strive for unity; but this could only be achieved by the pure Protestant doctrine of blessedness by faith alone. "This cannot be attained by any other means than the pure evangelic doctrine of salvation through faith alone." The report concludes, as follows: "After the exercises of the morning there was an informal reception, followed by a luncheon at the refectory, where the members of the faculty were the hosts. The visit of the archbishop has left a deep impression upon faculty and students. Their most vivid memory will doubtless be that of the man himself, distinguished in so many fields of endeavor, - scholar, author, poet, musician, administrator, - brilliant in every field, but always the perfect Christian gentleman, unfailing in courtesy and enthusiastic in appreciation, and himself the best exponent of that evangelic catholicity of which he speaks and writes. It is not necessary for us to agree with him in all things in order to see in him a peculiarly significant appearance in the religious world of our day, and even a passing contact with him is sufficient to explain the extent of the influence which he is exerting in the Protestant world, in Europe and, more recently, in America." Does not such recognition and fellowship as was given to Söderblom at Rock Island and Mount Airy strengthen the erring spirits and indifferentists, vex the weak, and deny the truth, at least indirectly? Can it be interpreted otherwise than as "giving aid and comfort to the enemies of Christ and His Church"? In Philadelphia, of course, one does not seem to have a particularly tender conscience in this respect. For example, in the same *bulletin* from which we have quoted, D. Delk, who was previously considered liberal, is listed among the "recent chapel speakers".

at the noon services on Wednesday," in the Mount Airy seminar. Indifferentism and Unionism is the straight road to Liberalism in our day. F. B.

As to the aims of the Boy Scouts, we gather from a St. Louis German newspaper the following, it seems, official information: "George West, the Boy Scout commissioner of the United States, was given permission [at a meeting] to make an address explaining the purposes and aims of this organization. The speaker described why he had decided to promote the Scout movement. He was only six years old when he was orphaned, and being a cripple to boot, he had many obstacles to overcome until he worked his way up through night schools, colleges, and the law department of a university. The late President Roosevelt was his friend, and with him he devoted himself to the problems of child welfare. The speaker admitted that many mistakes had been made in the Scout movement before he became a commissioner. One of these mistakes was the choice of the khaki uniform, by which many citizens were led to believe that the Scouts were to train recruits for militarism. It was to remove this prejudice that he had undertaken his tour of the country. He asserted that the Boy Scouts were neither under the control of the Government nor could they be made available to local authorities, as had often been falsely advertised. He summed up the purposes and aims of the organization in the following five points: 1. To develop one's strength, and consequently self-confidence, through gymnastics and physical exercises; 2. To acquire a thorough school education, even when members are compelled to earn their own living during school hours; each boy is advised to learn a trade for which he shows special aptitude; 3. To develop the character of boys; 4. To cultivate tolerance of fellow men; 5. To develop a sense of duty as citizens to the government and the common good. The speaker explained that the education of our youth had become a serious problem because many parents did not care how their sons and daughters spent their free time. In fact, he said, the nation today cares more about the welfare of pigs than the flourishing of the children who will form the next generation. Uncle Sam maintains two bureaus to promote hog welfare, but has no child welfare department to take care of the growing youth." - Only a few brief remarks on this. Mr. West's first statement is that the purpose of the Boy Scouts organization is to take care of neglected children who have either no parents or parents who neglect their children. To such children the organization seeks to substitute parents by teaching them, among other things, character, tolerance of fellow men, and a sense of duty as citizens. In principle, the organization does not want to have anything to do with children who are not neglected by their parents. The organization completely rejects the children of our Lutheran congregations. The members of our Lutheran congregations know no character building without ongoing, thorough instruction from God's Word. From God's Word the children of our Lutheran church members also learn "tolerance of fellow men" and "the sense of duty as citizens." It seems, however, that Mr. West, in the second part of his address, was describing the program of the

organization and extended it to "our youth" and to "adolescent youth" in general. Then there is the danger of the unseemly "centralization" of youth education to which the President of Columbia University has repeatedly and justly called attention. The somewhat drastic pictures which Mr. West has used to bring vividly into the light the nation's negligence in regard to youth education are likely to cause shaking of heads in Washington and elsewhere. The invocation of Roosevelt's consensus is also likely to raise concerns. Roosevelt was a strange man in more ways than one. But his special qualifications for normal youth education will be widely doubted. F. P.

That the Lodges are among the chief enemies of the parochial school is evident from the Scottish Rite Clip Service of January last, according to which they advocate, among other things, the notorious Oregon Lducatiou Lav. Among the objects they seek are: "the compulsory use of English as the language of instruction in the grammar grades; . . . the American public school, non-partisan, non-sectarian, efficient, democratic; for all the children of all the people; equal educational opportunities for all; ... the entire separation of Church and State and opposition to every attempt to appropriate public moneys, directly or indirectly, for the support of sectarian institutions." The first two objectives every citizen must reject as fanatical and parochial as they are un-American, unjust and tyrannical. But one can only decisively agree with the third goal, which is directed against the well-known presumptions and encroachments of the papists.

F. B.

Concerning the great red in Germany, our Board for Relief in Europe writes in the *Atlantic Bulletin,* among other things, as follows: "The sufferings of a large proportion of the German people have reached a point of acuteness which beggars all description. Letters from the other side - and they are coming to us by the hundreds and thousands - are like desperate cries from the bottomless pit of despair. Imagination need not be called upon to supply the missing details as we read such communications; naked facts, as they are told in simple words, produce an impression of horror that is not easily shaken off. Exaggeration of the terrible want is almost out of the question. Impartial observers of high standing confirm all the worst details. Unless help is forthcoming from outside of Germany, and forthcoming by the utmost speed possible, millions see nothing ahead of them but starvation, slow starvation, with all the agonies that accompany moral and spiritual disintegration. No other conclusion is possible on the basis of reports and direct appeals." F. B.

II. Abroad.

D. Amelung, chairman of the Lutheran Federation, describes the **seminary in Zehlendorf near Berlin in** the "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt" as "only a branch of foreign countries". D. Stallmann comments on this in "Schrift und Bekenntnis": "If D. Amelung thinks that such a school of theology as we have "could only be a branch of foreign countries," then we would like to ask: Is the "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt," of which it says in the same article by D. Amelung about the Magdeburg conference (p. 10): "That our "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt" remained alive in this time of general dying of the newspaper, we also thank, next to God's mercy, the

us by Lutheran brethren in America and South Africa,' a 'branch of the foreign country'? If not, why must it be a seminary existing with the help of brethren abroad?"

F. B.

"Scripture and Confession." Among the numerous journals, especially ecclesiastical ones, which have had to cease publication in Germany, is now also the above-mentioned. In its last issue it says: "After careful consideration and consultation with two conferences that have just been reached, we see ourselves compelled to discontinue the publication of this supplement to our "Evangelical Lutheran Free Church" for the time being. Its continued publication would only be possible if the synod treasury could make a disproportionately high contribution to the costs of the paper. But it is neither able nor entitled to do so, especially as the demands made upon it by the increase of our workers and the diminished contributory power of our congregations are constantly increasing." Even in America, our circles included, most of the scholarly-theological monthlies do not keep their heads above water financially. In accordance with the "conditions of the times," practical interest has come strongly to the fore in the present day. The sense of the time is directed to the deed, the church work. The feeling prevails everywhere: "The harvest is at stake; what is neglected now cannot be made up for later!" This calls for publications that do not offer scholarly studies but rather practical instruction and good all-round information. Increasing indifference to scholarly and theological work, however, is likely to lead in the long run to spiritual deadening and to the flattening, corruption and even falsification of Lutheranism. F. B.

The new catechism of the Lutheran Church of the Augsburg Confession in the Elfaß. The un-Lutheran character of this so-called new conference catechism, which has already been submitted to the Lutheran High Consistory in Alsace for approval, has been repeatedly pointed out by the "Elsässischer Lutheraner". In its issue of October 15, 1923, it includes the following testimony given by Mr. E. Sutter before the Higher Consistory, of which he is a member: "The remarks to which the new catechism gives me cause I make as a convinced adherent of the ecclesiastical right. I have had the opportunity to have a cursory look at the Catechism, and will readily acknowledge that it contains many merits. If, however, I were to look only at the part dealing with the doctrine of the faith, that is, only at the dogmatic part, it would not be possible for me to give the book my approval. The rubbery version of the answers cannot possibly meet with my applause. There may be in these answers what is confessional; but there may also be something quite different in them. In this respect, then, the book cannot satisfy me at all. The Christian, even in matters of faith, speaks the yes that is yes, and the no that is no." In spite of this position, Sutter voted for the approval of the new catechism, because it was at least better than the old one and other radical catechisms introduced by pastors on their own authority, and also because Lutheran congregations did not have to give up their Lutheran catechism. But what a wretched piece of work this new catechism is, is evident from the following statements of Father Scherf in the "Alsatian Lutheran": "It is not even correct to say that in the answers to the catechisms, the Lutherans have not been able to understand the meaning of the catechism.

which is confessional, since in many, one would say most, of the answers false doctrine is directly led. Or is it confessed that the Scriptures are written by 'men specially enlightened by the Holy Spirit,' that is, they are not inspired by the Holy Spirit, that is, they are not without error and fault? (p. 39, 1.) Is this confessed, when in the life of JEsu (p. 10, n. 6), vaunted above, it is said: 'He [JEsus] teaches, especially in the Sermon on the Mount, how we come into the kingdom of God'? The Sermon on the Mount is only a sermon on the law. ... Is it confessed that Christ is the Son of God, 'because he is in everlasting communion of spirit and love with the heavenly Father'?" (P. 736.) Christ is the Son of God because he is "born of the Father in eternity before all the world, God from God, light from light, true God from true God, born, not made, with the Father in one being, by whom all things were made.' (Nicene Symbolum.) Is this confessed, that the Holy Ghost, 'is the Spirit of God which was alive in JEsu,' that is, not an independent distinct person, but only a power in JEsu?" (S. 75, 1.) . . . Is this confessional, that this is only the meaning of baptism, that it only pictures 'how the Holy Ghost cleanseth the soul from all that defileth us'?" (p. 84, A. 6.) Is not baptism rather the bath of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost? ... Is it confessional that in the new Catechism one is entirely silent about original sin, the source and root of all sin? Is it confessional that the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith, the main doctrine of all Scripture, the doctrine by which the Christian Church stands and falls, is not addressed at all? Shall we give any more proofs how the new Catechism is not only unconfessional, but altogether unconfessional?" Also quoted is the debate of a pastor at a protest congregation, who writes in the "Kirchenblatt" with reference to the "Conference Catechism": "If one did not know it long ago, it should now have become clear to one that there is no longer an official Lutheran church of the Augsburg Confession in Alsace, but a Uniate church, in which there are still isolated Lutheran congregations and pastors." At the same time he raises the old question: "The question is whether the Lutheran pastors and congregations who are in the minority can remain in such a church in the future for the sake of their Lutheran conscience." God grant that these pastors and congregations, who still faithfully mean their Lutheranism, may have the holy courage to follow their conviction in deed, which, unfortunately, has been lacking not only in Alsace, but everywhere in the Lutheran regional churches of many otherwise sincere Lutherans!

F. B.

"The German Bible in Need!" In Germany a "German Bible Aid Society" has been formed, which has made it its business to promote the tasks of the German Bible Societies to the best of its ability. In an appeal issued by this association it says: "The economic collapse of our day has not stopped at the German Bible. Our Bible societies are now in the greatest distress. The new production of Bibles is at present made an impossibility. The end of German Bible distribution has come perilously close. "

F. B.

"Ein' feste Burg." In his new paper, "Luther's Trutzlied "Ein' feste Burg' in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart," the Jesuit Grisar denies that this Luther song was a storm song of Catholic soldiers during the World War. He also wants that in order to preserve confessional peace this "provocative song" should no longer be sung. D. Hans Preuß remarks in "Theologie der Gegenwart": "This reminds us very much of a well-known armistice, which first demanded the throwing away of weapons .

With reference to liberalism in China, of which "Lehre und Wehre" has repeatedly reported, Mission Director D. Knak writes in Berlin: "This [that critical theology is gaining ground in China] is in itself correct and should be taken much more seriously by us representatives of biblical Christianity, especially by us Lutherans [Knak belongs to the Vereinslutheran in the Prussian Union], than it usually is; for for the becoming of the Chinese church we are jointly responsible." At the same time Knak shows that D. Witte has misrepresented Tschang Tsching's position with reference to the person of Christ (cf. L. u. W. 1923, p. 382). The desired unified national church, Knak judged, would place the China mission even more under the influence of the Anglo-Saxon Reformed missions and their partly quite strong modernistic currents than it is already, but would only make the work more difficult for the Lutheran missions. China needs nothing so much as the gospel in the sense of Lucher. China needs Christians to whom the Bible has really become God's word, God's revelation, God's call, God's letter to the individual and to the whole; Christians who have understood and experienced what sin and guilt, grace and forgiveness mean; Christians who understand what Christian community and Christian church are. "The ecumenicity of Lutheranism must prove itself precisely in the fact that through its mission it knows how to proclaim the word of the cross intelligibly and effectively to that great people," Knak states very correctly. But when he concludes: "Neither critical nor positive theology can win this [China for Christianity], but only the gospel, the word of the cross," this is true also of modern positive theology, because it does not adhere exclusively to Scripture. Of Lutheran theology, however, this is not true. Luther knew no essential difference between theology and gospel. But he who does not have this theology will hardly leave the word of the cross unadulterated, undiminished, even in the preaching to the Gentiles.

F. B.

"Die Theologie der Gegenwart" and "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift" are among the publications which have so far kept their heads above water in the great German die-off of papers. The first sheet will even appear enlarged for 1924. D. Werner Scholl informs us: "The 'Theologie der Gegenwart,' in contrast to many a journal that has gone out of print, will not only continue to appear in 1924, but will also offer its readers even more than before, by monthly issues of one sheet each, by enlarging its material and its circle of contributors." The program for 1924 is: January: Philosophy and General Spiritual Life. Privy Councillor D. R. H. Grützmacher-Erlangen. - February: Culture, Religion, Theology. D. Grützmacher-Erlangen. - March: Dog-

matics and ethics. Private lecturer Die. W. Vollrath-Erlangen. - April: Practical Theology. Private lecturer Rev. D. Hupfeld-Bonn. - May: Pedagogy, edification and beautiful literature. Director D. Jordan-Wittenberg. - June: Old Testament. Privy Councillor Professor D. Dr. Sellin-Berlin. - July: Church History I; August: Church History II. Privy Councillor D. Dr. G. Grützmacher-Münster i. W. - September: Church History III; October: Church History IV and Christian Art. Prof. D. Dr. Preuß-Erlangen. - November: New Testament; December: History of Religion. Prof. D. Strathmann-Erlangen. Concerning the price Scholl remarks: "By fixing a certain and low basic price of 30 Pfennig for the issue and 3.60 Marks for the volume, the possibility of a pre-calculation of the costs is given." As far as the last issues of the "N. K. Z." are concerned, we read with interest in issue 10 of last year the article by D. Larfeld: "Die delphische Gallioinschrift und die paulinische Chronologie"; in issue 11 the article by Joh. Smemos: "Das kirchliche Leben Norwegens" and D. Walther's "Noch ein Wort zu Luthers Rechtfertigungslehre" (Another Word on Luther's Doctrine of Justification) against Karl Holl's constructions; in issue 12 Nägelsbach's remarks on "Wissenschaftliche Exegese und erbauliche Schriftauslegung" (Scientific Exegesis and Edifying Interpretation of Scripture), Jehle's "Senfkorn und Sauerteig in der Heiligen Schrift" (Mustard Seed and Leaven in Scripture) and "Die Hölle in Luthers Bibelübersetzung" (Hell in Luther's Translation of the Bible), and finally in the first issue of this year: "Zur Etymologie von El" (On the Etymology of El) by D. Procksch and "Ästhetischer Atheismus" (Aesthetic Atheism) by D. Lemme. - Whoever wishes to keep up to date with the theology (especially the positive) of Germany will not be able to do without the two journals edited by D. Scholl. F. B.

Concerning the freedom movement in South Africa, "Aufwärts" writes: "The growing self-confidence of the natives, the inner urge for freedom and independence, for independence from the Europeans, is alarming. Here and there there are already outbreaks of the fire slumbering in the depths. The most dangerous thing is that the political and ecclesiastical freedom movement is under the leadership of clever American Negroes, whose sinister activity is greatly strengthened by the power of the dollar. To this must be added that the missionary no longer enjoys the prestige and can exercise the influence as he did fifteen to twenty' years ago. The reputation of the whites has been greatly diminished by the last war, and is still more diminished in consequence of the free views of morality prevailing among them. . . . Added to this is the unreal competition of hostile missionaries, by which much is destroyed that had been built up in years of patient labor by the German missionaries, and the bad elements of the congregations often acquire a corrupting influence, so that they can cause confusion in the minds." The brutal expulsion of the German missionaries is beginning to take its toll. Negro Marcus Garvey, president of the Universal Negro Improvement Association, declared in a speech on Washington, "I thank the Ku Klux Klan for their frankness in saying, 'This is a white man's country.' This brings the negroes to a clearer race consciousness. America is for the white people, Europe is for the white people, Asia is for the yellow races, but Africa must be for the black man. The sooner European nations realize this fact and relinquish their African colonies, the better it will be for them." F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. **March 1924.** **No. 3.**

On the Evaluation of the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach.

At the last meeting of the World Convention, on Friday evening, August 24, the blessing and success of the World Convention was extolled, and the longer it lasted, the greater it would become. Much has been said and written about this since then, too. And as far as they have come to our attention, the judgements of all participants are favourable, admittedly in varying degrees. What one expects from a world convention depends on one's own theological and ecclesiastical position and attitude. Unionists and indifferentists will judge and assess differently than confessional Lutherans. Their standard is different. Unity in right doctrine and practice, which is essential to the latter, is considered a secondary matter by the former. Even subjective truthfulness all too often carries less weight with Unionists than interest. "It is not in their conscience," says Walther. They act and judge sometimes one way, sometimes another, according to circumstances and time. They can always do otherwise! Such judgments, therefore, have less significance for the thing itself than for the position of those who make them. They do not characterize what is judged, but rather the person making the judgment.

The all too rosy sentiments in some American statements about the success of the World Convention are not to be found in grandiose phrasemaking, but rather in the joy over the success of the planned enterprise, in the enthusiasm for the great relief work in Europe, and above all in the rampant attitude which admires external successes and settlements more and strives for them more eagerly than inner unity. In German judgments, too, the exuberance has its main reason in the indifferentism that prevails everywhere, but certainly also in the feeling of gratitude for help in great need already received and promised in the future, for the public honor and recognition shown to the Germans, who are slandered all over the world, by holding the World Convention in Eisenach, etc. Nor does it want to be overlooked that in all the Convention's

The enthusiasm for Luther and Lutheranism that is present in the members of the church, even though it is often unexplained, is known to see more than is really there.

For example, in German pronouncements it is said: The World Convention is "the hour of God which suddenly makes the worldliness of the Lutheran Church appear." "The Lutherans of all countries found each other in Eisenach." One was "united, in almost splendid unity in the faith and confession of the fathers." Eisenach presented the picture of the Lutheran Church "so massive and large that it seemed almost overwhelming - a mighty church, full of life, full of vigor." On the eternal ground "one found oneself more and more together, one grew together". In Eisenach we "experienced the unity of the Lutheran Church"; it was expressed in "power." "We may confidently place the days of Eisenach alongside what once happened in Augsburg in 1530." "We Lutherans have indeed drawn closer together. With honor we once again bear the beautiful name of 'Augsburg Confessors.'" "A lively spirit of faith and true love kept the World Convention from beginning to end on a level that compels us to unreserved praise and thanksgiving: 'The Lord has done great things for us, we are glad of it.'" "A spirit that blew through the whole meeting, the spirit of Lutheranism itself, proceeding from all and working back upon all-this spirit so all power and life." "We are thankful that it was granted to us to come together so completely beyond all separateness that we may say with faithful confidence: We will stay together!" 1)

1) The above pronunciations are taken from the "A. E. L. K.". The following examples show how they appear in context. D. Laible opens his report as follows: "For the first time since Luther's day a Lutheran World Convention has met, a unique Church Council, which has scarcely a predecessor. Unique already by its reason of origin; not out of need and struggles for doctrine, like the old councils, did one meet, but out of the need of love, which saw the brother fallen among the murderers lying in his blood. It is unique in that it differs from the numerous ecclesiastical attempts at unification of the present day, with their aim at outward unification, since one is not united inwardly; in the Lutheran World Convention one was united in almost splendid unity in the faith and confession of the Fathers. It was unique, finally, because of what it wanted to be and was, a Lutheran World Convention. For centuries the Lutheran Church had spread quietly, it was to be found in all parts of the world, but it was never seen together, it never came together, it was hardly known. For the first time its image appeared in Eisenach, so massive and large that it seemed almost oppressive. From more than thirty countries of the world some 150 delegates appeared, representing well over fifty million Lutherans of the world. The -public had become accustomed here and there to speak almost no more of a Lutheran Church; other names were more prominent.

The judgments of the Lutheran Federation and related theologians are more reserved. D. Kropatscheck, the leader of the Lutheran School Association, says in his "Volksblatt": "One can say it without over-

Dordergrund. Now it turned out that there was a mighty church with Luther's name on it, full of life, full of energy. . . . A single bond of the same faith united, as I have said, those who appeared. And yet, what diversity of nations, of opinions, of church work, of languages! . . . In Eisenach the idea of unity, of standing together on the eternal foundation, was pervasive. On this ground one found oneself more and more together, one grew together. The last day showed a warm parting of those who had come together." (A. E. L. K. 1923, p. 573.) Another report says: "What came out of the World Convention! I take up a word of Professor D. Wentz, who said it during a debate: 'The Lutheran Church will now stand before the world as one.' Yes, we not only discussed it in Eisenach, but we may confess it without exaggeration, we have experienced the unity of the Lutheran Church, which consists in the unanimous confession of the means of grace according to God's Word and Luther's Lehr'-we have experienced this unity. Unity in the sense of Rome cannot be important to us; the Church of the pure Word has never sought an external display of power. But if we are united in our good confession, then we do form a power with which the world must also reckon. And this unity and unanimity has been expressed with such power that we cannot be thankful enough for the strengthening of faith it has given us. We may confidently place the days of Eisenach alongside what once happened in Augsburg in 1530. But we were not only united in our principles; we also joined hands in faithful work. . . But now, in order to give outward expression to our firmly established inner unity and oneness, an even closer committee, a Continuation Committee, has been appointed. . . . We Lutherans have indeed moved closer together. With honor we once again bear the beautiful name "Augsburg Confession Relatives. By this we touch upon something that has been especially beneficial to us in Eisenach and which should be especially emphasized in all reports; we mean the cordial, fraternal intercourse among the participants. We not only worked and listened to lectures, but enjoyed hours and days of fellowship which refreshed us immensely. . . . The debates, some of which required much time, remained free from strife and pettiness. A lively spirit of faith and true love kept the World Convention from beginning to end on a level that compels us to unreserved praise and thanksgiving: "The Lord has done great things for us, and we are glad of it."- In the "Vorwärts" of August 21 of last year, Hans Bauer had judged of the Lutheran World Convention: "The people know nothing to do with it. The subject is no longer topical." D. Freiherr von Pechmann responds in the "Münchener Abendzeitung" of September 2: "overwhelming [in Eisenach] was already the throng which filled the wide spaces of the church again and again to the last seat, and deeply moving the consecrating mood of the listening, singing and praying congregation, in other words, of the people." Hans Bauer continues, "The spirit of Lutheranism no longer has any power." Pechmann replies, "That [that Bauer's statement was not truthful

tion: The conference had ecclesiastical significance; it may be considered a landmark in the history of the Lutheran Church. Especially those who came to Eisenach with not too high expectations left with gratitude. For not unhealthy enthusiasm, dreaming prematurely of a Lutheran World Church Federation, but sober self-restraint, not wanting to 'do' anything artificially, prevailed in the circle of participants." (Kirchenblatt, Nov. 3.) At the meeting of the Lutheran Federation in Magdeburg, Superintendent D. Anthes "expressed his satisfaction-

From the first day to the last, the World Convention has just shown that it is possible. What a diversity of individualities and nationalities, and how serious the tensions among the nationalities! And the churches as such: how different from one another in history, tradition, constitution, present situation, and how rich in shades even of dogmatic colour! And yet, there was a spirit that wafted through the whole conference, and this spirit (not only as it was embodied in an impressive abundance of important, distinctive personalities; no, the spirit of Lutheranism itself, emanating from all and having an effect on all) - this spirit was so full of power and life that I, in agreement with all those with whom I spoke after the conclusion of the Convention, have the deep and indelible impression that we have experienced great things, and that we may hope for greater things. Hans Bauer: "There are Germans who would die for their Germanness, Frenchmen who would die for their Frenchness, there are Communists, Socialists, Monarchists who would die for Crony Russia, the Republic, or the Kaiser; but there is hardly a Lutheran left who would go to his death for his Lutheranism." Pechmann replies by referring to the Baltic Bluß eugen. Equally dear, he continues, to those gathered at the World Convention is their Lutheranism. "Within the multiform Christianity with its wealth of gifts and powers of the most diverse kind, a special treasure of absolutely irreplaceable value is entrusted to us Lutherans. More than ever before we see misguided, poisoned, terminally ill souls, we see an almost hopelessly broken society in need of the healing powers which lie in the Lutheran understanding of the gospel. . . . We are all the more grateful that we have been able to come together for the first time, overcoming many and not insignificant difficulties, and that we have been able to come together so completely over and above everything that separates us that we can say with faithful confidence: we will stay together! Modest and inconspicuous are the forms on which we have agreed in order to ensure the continuity of the union established in Eisenach. But they correspond to the cautious growth of Lutheranism, and they will suffice for the time being. In the small 'narrower committee' an organ of Lutheranism as a whole has come into being which is capable of action and which, through the trusted men who form the larger committee, can and should enter into living connection and interaction with every Lutheran church, even the smallest. The incoherent fragmentation of Lutheranism has been overcome: a strengthening of Lutheranism and thus at the same time - so it is meant - of Protestantism as a whole (a strengthening, as much as we care, of all Christendom), from which we find justified in hoping for beneficial consequences for church and world." (643.)

The "Lutheran Zeitblatt" also notes: "It is gratifying to note that there was widespread agreement in the assessment of the accomplishments and future of the Lutheran World Convention between representatives of the Iowa and Ohio Synods. The "Lutherische Zeitblatt" still remarks: "Happily there was a wide agreement in judgment of the achievements and future of the Lutheran World Convention between the representatives of the Iowa and Ohio Synods sReu, Hein, and von Fischer, who attended the meeting in Magdeburg^ and those of the Lutheran Federation." The same paper further states, "The Lutheran World Convention, so eagerly awaited, has offered much and, under God's assistance, has passed off well. Those who went to Eisenach with exaggerated expectations in the hope that an organized unification of all Lutheran churches, or at least a firmly united world conference, would come about there, admittedly found themselves disappointed. But anyone who judged the real situation with Lutheran sobriety, who was also aware that there were still many serious questions to be solved before anything of the kind would be possible, can be inwardly satisfied by the course of the Convention and rejoice in what was actually achieved. The Convention was intended to bring together Lutherans in the wider world for mutual acquaintance, for discussion of important questions, for strengthening in the confession of the Lutheran Church, for fostering brotherly love." This, he said, was what the Convention accomplished. The election of the Select Committee, it continues, "has opened the way for further development and shaping of the Lutheran World Convention. There will still be many important questions to be resolved. The Lutheran Federation can and will joyfully cooperate in the solution of this task, keeping in mind the goal that the Lutheran confession in all its aspects will be given full expression, so that through the World Convention the Lutheran Church will be built and God's Word and Luther's teachings will increasingly be a blessing to all of Christendom.

The judgment of W. Gußmann, editor of the "Old Faith", a conservative journal, which has long been one of the many journals that have had to cease publication as a result of the red times, does not sound quite so reserved. In the "Lutherisches Zeitblatt" of January of this year, Gußmann wrote: "Like all the participants, I too look back on the Eisenach days with a feeling of grateful exaltation. It was something great, heart-stirring and faith-strengthening that Lutheranism, after so many years of mutual isolation and alienation, finally found the strength to break through all barriers, national and political as well as historical and ecclesiastical, to rally around the banner of the Reformation confession in brotherly unity of faith, and thus to present itself to the outside world as a unified spiritual power with special gifts, a

I am grateful for the fact that the conference gave me the opportunity to emerge in a unique form of life and in a worldly vocation that only belongs to her. The many unclear and unfinished things, in some cases also unpleasant things, which the conference brought with it, cannot disturb me in these feelings of warm gratitude. For where would there be a first attempt among us mortals that did not have similar imperfections? On the other hand, I am not able to join in the rushing songs of praise which have been raised from various quarters in honor of the Convention. "A new stage in the development of the Lutheran Church', 'a milestone in the history of Protestantism as a whole': these are phrases that are all too reminiscent of the style of the Wilhelminian age, with its well-known predilection for erecting a world-historical milestone at every street corner. We have certainly experienced great things. Powerful impulses have been given, fruitful seeds have been sown, far-reaching prospects have been opened up. But how much of all this will come to fruition, grow, and finally bear abundant fruit, is truly in the hands of a higher power, which distributes success and failure according to its divine good pleasure, and depends no less on the wisdom, faithfulness, and determination with which the appointed forces will continue to nurture and develop the work that has been begun. Therefore, no small responsibility rests upon the continuation committee. May it never be lacking in energetic men who, filled with the greatness of the task at hand, will apply their best knowledge and ability to develop the World Convention into the living center of the entire Lutheran Church on this side and on the other side of the seas!" (51.)

It was primarily the men of the United Lutheran Church who aroused interest in the World Convention everywhere and finally got the ball rolling. Their judgments are also extremely optimistic and do not suffer from too much modesty. At Seminary Day in Philadelphia, D. Knubel declared: "The convention was the first fully [?] representative Lutheran World Convention. There was a fear of interjecting anything that might cause division and disruption. There was an intense desire to effect the establishment of Lutheranism as a world force. The conference recorded its unfaltering devotion to the Word of God and the Confessions of the Church. God is working out some great purpose through us. *(Phil. Sem. Bulletin.)* Thus Knubel regards the World Convention as a Scriptural and confessional movement with which God has great things in view. D. Morehead judged similarly on the same occasion. He sees in the World Convention a divine answer to prayer, a miraculous work of the Holy Spirit, and the beginning of a great Lutheran world mission. In his speech he says: "The successful organization of such a convention, with delegates from twenty-two countries, assembling after the most terrible war in history, could only have been effected in answer to most earnest prayer by devout

men in all lands and by the power of God's Holy Spirit Himself. As America is about to realize its world mission, so the Lutheran Church of America, too, is on the eve of a recognition of its world mission." Also at Seminary Day, pew director Miller stated, "The convention as a whole went beyond the highest hopes of the delegates. American energy and initiative secured definite organization and assured the continuance of the work begun at Eisenach."

In America, probably no one has so highly estimated and enthusiastically praised the World Convention as D. Melhorn, the editor of the *Lutheran* and reporter in Eisenach. The World Convention is regarded by him as a tremendous step forward in the right direction, as the beginning of a new epoch in the development of Lutheran Christianity, as a wonderful unifying work of the Holy Spirit, as an organization to which every Lutheran should affiliate and for which he should give thanks to God. In the *News Bulletin of* the N. L. C. Melhorn wrote: "There was universal satisfaction among the representatives, and interested visitors likewise felt that an epochal forward step for world Christianization had been taken by the Lutheran Church. Not only present and tremendous needs led the delegates to the conclusions they adopted, but a vision of great future service. They all testify that the Holy Spirit was in their midst to guide and to unify them. It would seem an obvious responsibility in Lutheran churches in all lands to ratify the organization, to support it in its work, and to thank God that the prayers for unity have been heard and assured in so definite a measure." Further, "The Eisenach convention is one sign that another epoch of evangelical development is at hand. . . . We are now all athrill with the vernal forces which Christ, the Head of the Church, is driving through the body of believers."

In the same vein of admiration Melhorn speaks in *The Pastors Monthly,* published within the Ohio Synod by Pastors Schutte, Hein, and Freseman. Here it is said, among other things: "You recall that it was freely prophesied that Eisenach would be another 'talk-fest,' developing speeches and no action. Naturally even the delegates were surprised when a real unity [epochal in quality] emerged." "No assemblage of delegates during the past three hundred years has achieved such great success towards unity. The possibilities for sustaining and extending the kingdom of Jesus Christ that now lie within the vision of thoughtful and consecrated Lutherans are an inspiration that can only be partially portrayed by words." "God the Holy Spirit [the vital Power that controlled the hearts of the convention] found in the delegates men whom He could use." "I had opportunity to see some of the delegatee intimately. I heard them remark, 'Only the Lord Jesus can have brought this to pass.'" "The phenomena of spiritual guidance were there. They

were as plain as though tongues of flame had sat upon the delegates' heads." "The Lutheran churches are pledged to God in the largest work since the period of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The Holy Spirit was in the midst of those who assembled in the name of Jesus at Eisenach. It is He, and not men, that opened the door, tore away barriers, and bade the men go forward. You must not, you dare not, in safety flinch or turn the back to the task that is ours. . . . The greatest movement for evangelism in four centuries will follow your acceptance of the trust." (643 ff.)[2])

More sober are the pronouncements of the representatives of Iowa and Ohio. Their judgment is essentially the same as that of the Lutheran Federation. The Iowa "Kirchenblatt" of November 3 writes: "For those who participated in the Convention, the days of Eisenach will certainly be and remain valuable and promising; it was, after all, the first time in the history of Lutheranism that representatives of so many Lutheran churches from so many countries came together to discuss the weal and woe of the Lutheran Church. This first convention probably skilfully avoided many pitfalls and thereby avoided shipwreck. The great distress threatening the Lutheran Church, especially in Germany, Russia, Poland, Hungary, etc., the dangers facing all Lutheran churches, the great apostasy: all contributed to keeping the representatives of the Church who met in Eisenach together, strengthening one another and stirring one another to intercession. May it please God to cause a real blessing to flow from Eisenach into the Lutheran Church of the world!" Further, "This Convention was, after all, in the last analysis only a free conference, binding no one, least of all the churches whose representatives were present. It was also carefully avoided to pass resolutions which would have to presuppose a unity of the represented churches. One has been very reserved and cautious here, much to the regret of some Americans who would have liked to see a summary of world Lutheranism. Others, like the Archbishop of Sweden, went still further; they wanted a summary of all world Protestantism into one strong power - in the field of politics. That the Lutheran Church can only represent a unity when all parts unreservedly profess the confession of the Church, that one does not want to have word. Unity in doctrine is

2) Among the enthusiastic eulogists of the World Covenant is D. Wentz of Gettysburg. His debate in the last assembly at Eisenach has already been communicated to "Lehre und Wehre" (p. 24). In the *Lutheran Quarterly* of October B.C. his verdict is: "It was a notable event. In the perspective of another century it will probably appear as the most important event in the history of the Lutheran Church since the days of the Reformation itself." (408.)

not necessary, if one only did works of love together. In short, the most blatant unionism was also heard in Eisenach. If one asks: What did the Convention accomplish at Eisenach? one will receive various answers. Many are inclined to make this Convention out to be a great event in church history, and to expect great things from it for Lutheranism in the world. One thought that this day of Eisenach should be placed side by side with that of Augsburg, June 28, 1530. Only the future will have to teach what the significance of the day actually is, or what it will grow into."

The "Ecclesiastical Review" of the Iowa Synod does not display a particular degree of confidence in the World Convention either, as is already evident from the debates cited in our January issue (p. 23 f.). Nor is there much optimism in Iowa about the future of the World Convention. The "A. E. L. K." of January 25 brings a "Letter from America" (probably written by D. Reu), which criticizes the actions of the Executive Board of the United *Lutheran* Church, as well as debates of the *Lutheran,* with reference to the World Convention as presumptuous, and then concludes with the words: "It is a tender little plant that has been sunk into the ground in Eisenach. Whether it will be nurtured in this way [as one proceeds in the U. L. C.]?" exceedingly favorably is the verdict of D. Hein of the Ohio Synod. Never, he says, had he attended a meeting which displayed such earnestness and such "truly wholesome evangelical Christianity" as the Convention at Eisenach! In *The Pastors Monthly*, he states: "When I recall the papers and discussions which I was permitted to hear, and the meetings and services which I was permitted to attend, not to forget the inspirational service in the courtyard of the Wartburg, with its splendid addresses by Bishop Ihmels and Dr. Jacobs, and the soul-stirring service in the courtyard of the Wartburg, with its splendid addresses by Bishop Ihmels and Dr. Jacobs, and the soul-stirring service in the courtyard of the Wartburg. Jacobs, and the soul-stirring chorals rendered by a chorus of *Kurrendeschueler,* I must say that the Eisenach convention furnished a rich repast, and I am deeply grateful to the brethren who sent me as one of their delegates, and to the Lord, who permitted me to attend and partake of this repast." "Let me say, first of all, that this very convention showed that there is life, a deep spiritual life, the gift of the Holy Spirit, in the hearts of the leaders of those churches. I have attended many conventions, many within our own synod and some without, but I have never attended a convention like that at Eisenach. Every paper, every address, every sermon, every speech, showed such a depth of spirituality, such earnestness and zeal and love for Christ and the Church, that again and again the thought came to me, 'Here are indeed men in whom God's Holy Spirit is accomplishing His work.' I have never attended a meeting that showed such earnestness and devotion, not of a Pietistic sort, but truly healthy [?] evangelical Christianity."

When further asked whether the World Convention had achieved its purpose, Hein replied: "I heard this question discussed by different men. Some, evidently under the influence of the large proportions of this representative gathering and all the inspirational services and addresses and carried away by spontaneous enthusiasm, concluded at once that a new era had come for the Lutheran Church of the world. Others remained sober. From men whom I consider conservative Lutherans I heard that many of the men present, especially the members of the Allgemeine Lutherische Bund and all the free churches, had accepted the invitation of the Allgemeine Ev.-Lutherische Konferenz very reluctantly. They had come to Eisenach doubting that this convention would be of any benefit whatever. They expected that on every occasion Luther's great battle-hymn, 'A Tower of Strength,' would be sung, and that a number of bombastic resolutions would be passed saying nothing. Knowing at least a little of German conditions, I confess that I went to Eisenach expecting similar things. These men, however, were agreeably surprised. I heard them say that the testimony, especially of some of the foreign delegates, on the inspiration of the Scriptures, the confession of the Church, altar and pulpit fellowship, Christian education, and the like, had strengthened them in their position and had not failed to impress those who are at the present time trying to readjust the affairs of the Church. I heard this at a meeting of the Lutheran Federation at Magdeburg and in private conversation."

According to Hein, there was no organization in Eisenach. He also believes himself justified in the judgment that the World Convention made no attempt at a union contrary to Scripture and the Confession. (Cf. L. u. W., Jan., p. 22.) Even faithful Lutherans, Hein assures us, could participate in the Convention as it was held at Eisenach with a clear conscience and without denying the truth. In *Pastor's Monthly* Hein writes: "On the floor of Joint Synod undoubtedly an opportunity will be given to state our reasons [for voting for the adoption of the resolutions at Eisenach]. At this time I merely wish to say that, if the position of the Joint Synod of Ohio in doctrine and practise is the truly Lutheran position and in full accord with the divine Word and the Lutheran Confessions, this synod ought never to stand aloof when it is given an opportunity to bear witness unto the truth, and when there is a possibility that its testimony will be heard. . . . And I believe that we can do so without entering into entangling alliances, which imply unionism and a denial of Lutheran principles."

Among the synods that were not represented in Eisenach was our Missouri Synod. Why did we not participate? The reason is not because we believed that we could compete with the United Lutheran Church people and the German church regents, pro-.

The reason for this is not that we were not invited to sit together and discuss doctrinal differences in free conferences, caeteris paribus, or that we were not allowed to confess our faith and represent our position before an assembly such as the one held in Eisenach. Nor is the cause to be found in the fact that we were not invited. On the contrary, urgent and heartfelt requests were made to us to participate in the Convention with seven representatives. But the synod in Fort Wayne refused. This refusal was not based on considerations of practicality and usefulness. Not in lack of interest in the unity of the Lutheran Church. Not in lack of understanding of the high value of a union and united front of all Lutherans in the world. Nor in a lack of compassion for the distress of the Lutheran Church, especially in Germany: its physical distress, its spiritual distress, its distress with all kinds of false doctrines, even liberal spirits in its own midst, with the advance of the sects, the propaganda of the Jesuits, etc. Some of our opponents probably take this opportunity to resort again to such explanations as narrow-mindedness, unkindness, aloofness, Pharisaism, selfishness, or the endeavor always to build only their own synod. Whatever reasons may be attributed to us, the fact is and remains that we did not participate in Eisenach because, as things stood, we did not believe we could do so with a clear conscience. We declined the invitation because we considered the Convention, as it was conceived and planned from the very beginning, to be unionist. Without denying the truth, without violating the scriptural and confessional norms for the activity of church fellowship, without causing public annoyance, and without inner untruthfulness, we could not make ourselves jointly responsible for the Convention, as it was planned and then conducted, by participating in accordance with the program. And in spite of all the praise, we are still convinced, and even more so after the course of the same, that the Convention was not a gathering that met the requirements of Scripture and the Lutheran Confession.3)

3) The Free Churches in Germany and Alsace, which are connected with us, also did not accept the invitation, because they considered the World Convention to be unionistic in its entire structure. The "Freikirche" judges: "It is leading men in the Lutheran churches of Germany who have taken the floor here. The World Convention will only become a blessing for the Lutheran Church and thus also for other churches if it returns in repentance to the literal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and thereby finally puts an end to the outpourings of human ideas in matters of faith, and if it therefore also places itself fully and completely under the confession of the Fathers, for this confession is nothing other than a manly testimony to the truth of the Scriptures. But the representatives of the Universal Convention are

The reports and judgments that have come to our attention do not allow us to discuss the question of whether the Eisenach Convention, as planned and held, could really be considered a movement pleasing to God and could stand before the judgment seat of Scripture and the Confession. And yet the correct answer to this very question is the prerequisite for a right estimate and judgment of it. Whether the World Convention was a success or not; what consequences it would have for the future; whether it was viable or would soon come to an inglorious end like the Interchurch Movement, which was officially laid to rest on December 12 of last year. World Movement: these and other things are second-rate matters. For every Lutheran, the first and foremost question was and remains whether one could identify with the World Covenant in good conscience, without disloyalty to Christian truth and without violation of truthfulness. However, neither Scripture nor our confession leaves us in any doubt about what is regarded in the Lutheran Church as a prerequisite for the activity of brotherly faith fellowship.

According to the Augsburg Confession, one may demand neither too much nor too little for church fellowship. He who declares human things necessary demands too much. He who considers the divine superfluous demands too little. He who considers no more, but also no less, necessary than unity in the doctrine and practice demanded by Holy Scripture, demands enough, just enough. "Satis est" - it is said in the Augsburg Confession - "It is enough for the true unity of the Christian Church that the Gospel be preached with one accord according to pure understanding, and that the sacraments be administered according to the divine Word. And is it not necessary for the true unity of the Christian church, that uniform ceremonies, instituted by men, should be held everywhere; as Paul saith, Eph. 4,

People of ecclesiastical union, and can do no saving deed out of the spiritual pacifism of their souls. If we could exchange ourselves in this, no one would rejoice more than ourselves." The "Alsatian Lutheran" writes: "Our Synod refused to participate in this meeting because of its unionist character. The deputies of the various Lutheran synods were precisely expected to come together and act as brothers in the faith. But this was not possible for us. . . . As far as the reports so far show, it was not at all the purpose of the Lutheran World Convention to bring about unity in doctrine among the churches calling themselves Lutheran in the world, but simply to establish a united front of the Lutheran churches, regardless of their doctrinal positions, for common church work. Not for a moment did the Lutheran World Convention think of striving for unity in doctrine; for if it had done so, it would probably have failed on the very first day. Had it done so, it would not have allowed the Modernist Söderblom and kindred spirits to take a leading part. Had he done so, he could not have made a D. Ihmels chairman until he had fully acknowledged the divine inspiration of the Scriptures."

5. 6: 'One body, one Spirit, as ye are called unto one hope of your profession; one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'" With this the Formula of Concord agrees, which closes its 10th article with the declaration: "In this way the churches will not condemn each other because of inequality of ceremonies, since in Christian liberty one has less or more of the same, if they otherwise agree with each other in doctrine and all the same articles, also in the right use of the holy sacraments, according to the well-known saying: Dissonantia jejunii non dissolvit consonantiam fidei, 'Inequality of fasting shall not separate unity of faith.'" In all human pieces, then, the Lutheran confessors were willing to yield. But "for the sake of temporal peace, tranquillity, and unity, to yield something to the eternal, unchangeable truth of God," they declare in the conclusion of the Eleventh Article, they were not willing to do so. They too, they say, bear "hearty desire and love" to unity, but only to such unity "by which God's honor [remains] uninjured, the divine truth of the holy Gospel is not surrendered, the least error is not conceded, poor sinners are brought to true, right repentance, are established by faith, are strengthened in new obedience, and thus by the one merit of Christ alone are justified and eternally saved."

It follows, of course, that according to our confession church fellowship and brotherly intercourse with false teachers and churches devoted to all kinds of false doctrine is reprehensible and displeasing to God. This is clearly expressed, for example, in the appendix to the Schmalkaldic Articles. Here first such Bible passages are quoted as Matth. 7, 15: "Beware of false prophets"; Gal. 1, 8: "But if we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel to you than that which we have preached to you, let him be accursed"; Tit. 3, 10: "Avoid a heretical man, if he has been admonished once and again"; 2 Cor. 6, 14: "Do not pull on a strange yoke with unbelievers" etc.. Then follows the well-known declaration: "It is hard to want to separate from so many countries and people and to lead a special doctrine. But here is God's command that everyone should beware and not be of one mind with those who lead unrighteous doctrine or intend to maintain it with rage." (§ 41f.)

The position of the Missouri Synod is consistent with these pronouncements. From the very beginning we have been very earnest in advocating the unity and fellowship which our confession describes and demands. And to this position we intend to remain faithful, if only because we call ourselves Lutherans, which no one has a full right to do who in the important doctrine of church fellowship abandons the Lutheran confession; but above all because we have convinced ourselves from Scripture that this position has been declared to be true by God in his word

is demanded. There is hardly a warning that Scripture repeats more often and more earnestly than the warning against false teachers and brotherly intercourse with them. To the passages already mentioned we only add Rom . 16, 17: "Now I urge you, brethren, to watch for those who cause division and offence apart from the doctrine which you have learned, and to depart from them. For such serve not the Lord JEsu Christo, but their belly, and by sweet words and glorious speech they deceive innocent hearts." Like our fathers, we also have hearty desire and love for brotherly fellowship with all Lutherans, indeed all Christians in the world, on the ground of unity in doctrine and practice. If such unity of spirit had been displayed at the World Convention, or even if it had been striven for with earnestness and in the right way, how gladly we Missourians would have been present, especially in these evil, indifferentistic and unionistic times of ours! And wherever, in the future, a sincere effort is made, without any accessory to weigh down our consciences, to achieve such true Christian unity in the truth, we do not wish to stand aloof and refuse to cooperate. We will remain at home only where our cooperation is made impossible from the outset.

But, say some, just such an impeccable, healthy Lutheran and godly assembly of fellow believers, all united in the truth, was the Convention in Eisenach! The fact is that it was not characterized in any other way in the official announcements and other pronouncements of the "A. E. L. K." and other papers. The "Festive Number" already described in "L. u. W." (p. 9) contains on the first page under the image of Christ, as it were as a motto for the World Convention, the words of Luther: "If you have God's Word, then you are quite strong and firm, so that you can remain undisturbed, come the devil or his messengers." This saying of Luther's recalls the word of Christ John 8:31, 32: "If ye abide in my word, ye are my disciples indeed, and shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." A congregation of disciples of JEsu, who in all things hold fast to the speech of their LORD and Master-what faithful Lutheran in the world would not gladly, and could not with a good conscience, join in the same? That would be a convention like the one we had at the synod in Fort Wayne, where the invitation to the world convention was declined!

On its second page, the "Festnummer" once again lets Luther speak, in large letters, about the unity of the Spirit, the "one and the same pure and clear doctrine" that all Christians should confess with one accord. The glorious passage reads, as follows: "One body and one Spirit, even as ye are called unto one hope of your profession. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God, and one

Our Father of all', etc. This is the cause that should move Christians to hold fast to the unity of the Spirit, because they are all members of one body and partakers of all spiritual goods. For they have all the same treasure, one God and Father in heaven, one Lord and Saviour, one word, baptism, and faith, and, in sum, one blessedness. Wherefore the unity of the church is not called and is, having and keeping one and the same outward government, law, or statute, but where this unity of one faith, baptism, etc., is. Therefore it is called one, holy, catholic, or Christian church, that there be one pure and sincere doctrine of the gospel, and outward confession thereof, in all places of the world, and at all times, no matter what other disparity and difference of outward bodily life or outward ordinances be." "One pure and upright doctrine of the gospel, and outward confession thereof in every place of the world, and at all times!" This is certainly the right slogan for a world convention that calls itself Lutheran and is and wants to remain Lutheran in fact and in truth.

The readers will ask: Was it really meant in this way? Were the words of Luther in the "Festnummer" really meant to characterize what the leaders, among whom was also the editor of the "A. E. L. K.", had in mind with the World Convention, and how they intended to convene and lead it? The answer is given by D. Laible, who, according to his "Kirchenzeitung" of June 15 of last year, declared before the conference in Leipzig, among other things: "In this respect, this World Convention is something quite different from the many other attempts at international church connections. These are based on the principle that 'only love can help unity over differences of faith'. But Christ first demanded confession, unity of faith, unity in truth, and then showed it the way of love. This is the way by which the Lutheran World Convention is to come about. May it also gain the strength, even if not to resolve the difficult questions of politics that still divide us, to carry them in the strength of the Pentecostal spirit. For the Convention wants to reawaken the spirit of the Reformation in the Church of the Reformation. This is also shown by the three themes set for Eisenach: 'The Ecumenical Character of the Lutheran Church'; 'The Confession the Indispensable Ground of the Lutheran Church'; 'What Can the Lutheran Church Do for the Unity of Christendom?'" (This last topic was not included in the program; cf. L. u. W., p. 10.) According to Laible, the World Convention was meant to demand unity in the confession of truth, in contrast to other world conferences, and not to be satisfied with unity beyond the differences of faith.

Unity of faith is not to be first established in Eisenach, but the

already existing are expressed and actuated. This is also the meaning of the invitation letter signed by D. Ihmels and D. Larsen signed the letter of invitation. Not a word is implied here that the doctrinal differences within world Lutheranism are to be examined in Eisenach in order to establish, with God's help, real, full unity in the spirit and thus to make true Luther's word of the "one pure and clean doctrine. Rather, this unity is assumed to already exist among all Lutherans who formally profess the symbols. The letter states, "We believe that the time has come when adherents of the Lutheran Confessions throughout the world should meet in conference to discuss with one another matters of present and future moment." "We believe that the Lutherans of the world recognize to-day more fully than ever in their history the strength of the bond of faith which stretches across all lines of race and nation and makes them one. This bond has always existed, but we have been too little conscious of it to give it adequate expression, even through conferences." The purpose of the World Convention, the letter goes on to explain, is neither to create a new international organization nor to seek any changes in the existing church bodies, but to strengthen and expand the already existing cooperations at home and in the mission fields.

Among the Lutheran synods of America, which all accept the confession, the right unity already exists; the differences in doctrine and practice that are found among them are not church-dividing; There is nothing to prevent these synods from recognizing one another, from entering into brotherly fellowship with one another, from carrying on the work of the church together, and perhaps even from uniting outwardly; their task is not both to establish unity, but rather to express the unity which has long existed, and to put it into practice, at least in common ecclesiastical work: this has hitherto been the position of the United Lutheran Church. Now the World Convention, which has come about primarily through men from the United Lutheran Church, wants to extend this to all Lutheranism in the world. According to the letter of invitation, the necessary unity already exists among all Lutherans who formally profess their symbols. Eisenach was not meant to establish it, but only to express it and make it work. In any case, there is nothing in the letter of invitation to say that there are differences in doctrine and practice among Lutherans in the world that stand in the way of church fellowship; that these must be clearly pointed out and eliminated; that this should be done in Eisenach or that a serious attempt should be made to do so. In short, for the Convention in Eisenach, unity of faith should not be the goal, but the starting point.

If the purpose of the World Convention had been to establish right unity of spirit among all Lutherans in the world, so as to clear the way everywhere for universal brotherly fellowship, the program should also have expressed this. (Cf. L. u. W., p. 10.) "Wherein consist the differences which at present divide the Lutheran churches, and how can they be removed?" - a similar theme should not have been lacking. The lectures should have given occasion for the discussion also of such questions as: What is the right position to take toward the liberals? Can people like Söderblom and Th. Kaftan still be considered Lutherans? May a Lutheran convention recognize them as members? How is one to judge the existing church fellowship in the regional churches with obvious heresies? how about prayer, pulpit, communion and work fellowship with the Reformed and the sects? how about the connection of the Lutheran regional churches with the "German Protestant Church Federation" that came into being some years ago? How about the church and altar fellowship established last year between the Anglicans and Sweden? How about the "Church Movement for Lasting Peace," which includes all sects and denominations and is headed by the Archbishop of Sweden, and which is to meet in Stockholm in 1925? How about Lutherans in the Union and their recognition as members of the World Covenant? How about the relationship of the United Lutheran Church to the Federal Council? How about the German people's churches, which on principle treat Christians as well as un-Christians as members of the congregation? How about their practice of baptism, confirmation, Holy Communion, and burial? How about the fact that conservative and liberal preaching takes place in one and the same pulpit? How about the maxim of protecting minorities, i.e. false teachers? How about the toleration of Freemasons and members of other lodges as pastors? How about the fact that in wide circles, both here and there, the confession is formally accepted, but in actual doctrine and practice it is denied? How about university professors who deprive theological youth of their Bible faith? And how about Lutheran theologians and churchmen who openly and decisively deny the literal inspiration of Holy Scripture, the doctrine of two natures, the vicarious suffering of Christ, etc.?

These and similar questions should not all have been ignored and pushed aside by the program if the World Convention had intended to establish the unity necessary for church fellowship in the sense of Luther and the Lutheran confession. Unity is already there; the task is only to express it, to make it work. The fact that the program was established on the basis of this thought is also shown by the communal devotions, church services, and meetings scheduled for the Convention in the same program.

Celebrations that are only justified among those who are already brothers in the faith and confessors of the "one and the same pure and truthful doctrine of the Gospel". In short, the program also presupposes the unity of spirit necessary for church fellowship as already existing among all Lutherans.

The right unity does not need to be established, it is present - this was the basic tone from the beginning to the end, also in the assemblies. The fraternal intercourse, the common devotions, services and celebrations proclaimed it loudly: We are all of one mind! This was also expressed in the public speeches, in the lectures and in the unanimous adoption of the confessional and organizational resolutions. (L. u. W., p. 20.) In the very first meeting on Monday Morehead spoke of the "actual unity in the faith" which was to be expressed by "a common good confession. "4) The same opinion was expressed by Söderblom, who also declared in the meeting on Monday: "We have not come here to organize ourselves, but to edify and strengthen ourselves in the common faith." (Sp. 579.) In his lecture, "The Confession as the Indispensable Foundation of the Church," Jörgensen held that all the churches which have accepted the Lutheran Confession (of course as it is at present done, and as they are at present constituted and were represented at Eisenach) can and should unite for common work. When it was pointed out by members of the Lutheran Federation and by some Americans that the confession should prevail in doctrine and practice and not merely be officially accepted, and when the finger was pointed at other wounds, too, it was said that the Lutheran Confession should be accepted as a confession.

4) To the question, "How can we continue to help one another?" Morehead answered: 1. by a good confession; 2. by exchange of professors, establishment of a central bureau for church news, and accurate statistics; 3. by common spiritual and material support of the small groups of Lutherans scattered over many nations of Europe; 4. By establishing a Lutheran center for emigrants; 5. By joint missionary work in non-Christian countries; 6. By establishing a central office for the bodily support of fellow believers and others in need; 7. By arbitration of disputes between Lutheran groups by Lutheranism as a whole. On point 1, Morehead says: "On the basis of a common good confession expressive of actual unity in the faith, a firm program of practical relief is both desirable and possible." On point 2, it says: "The works of theological science must at all times be made known to the theologians of the Church in all parts of the world for the defense and propagation of the faith." According to the organizational resolution passed at Eisenach, the Executive shall also take into account Morehead's above suggestions. "It shall take note of the several 'suggestions' which were stated in the paper of Dr. J. A. Morehead." (A. E. L. K. 1923, sp. 637 f.; *Pastors Monthly* 1923, p. 763; L. u. W., p. 21.)

Jörgensen explained that, in spite of all the differences of opinion, the basis for unification was still there, because everyone had a unanimous will to confess. (Cf. L. and W., p. 18.) The Convention as such left it at that.

In his welcoming address on Monday, Bishop Ihmels said, "We meet here as disciples of JEsu and speak with the Psalm according to Luther's translation: 'I am in earnest.'" (Sp. 576.) This earnestness, however, was not manifested in the Convention's endeavoring to remove existing doctrinal differences, but to ignore them, and to gain practical results from the unanimity assumed to be already present. Differences of opinion and tensions concerning the composition of the Executive were carefully considered and settled in Eisenach.5) But of any difference in doctrine and practice which would have been eliminated, or which even the Convention as such or through committees would have endeavored to discuss thoroughly, nothing is to be found in the reports. The leaders, especially from the U. L. C., sought to keep out everything that threatened to frustrate the coveted practical goal. "There was an intense desire to effect the establishment of Lutheranism as a world force," remarks D. Knubel. Melhorn writes: "The American delegation thought in the direction of unifying the Church every time they gave consideration to the future safety of the Christian Church. . . . Any one who interfered with 'something practical to come from the convention' was bidding for lasting unpopularity." *(Pastor's Monthly,* 1923, 644.) The all driving motive was the will to organize. We are therefore hardly mistaken if we also understand Knubel's words: "There was a fear of interjecting anything that might cause division and dissension" to mean that in Eisenach they were decidedly averse to a thorough discussion of the differences in doctrine and practice that existed in world Lutheranism. We are united and can unite together - this position, taken from the very beginning, was not to be shaken by anyone, not even at the Convention itself, and was not to be misled by anything. And how then in the last meeting of the World Convention and also since then in Germany and America the unity in Eisenach has been praised, we have already reported about this at the beginning of this article.

However, all that glitters is not gold. What do the facts say about the much-vaunted unity of Eisenach? The slogan was: "One and the same pure and honest doctrine of the gospel and outward confession of the same in all places of the world and at all times! Was this

5) D. Knubel reports: "At one point, when the American delegates were divided in opinion on the floor, the convention adjourned to permit the American delegates to confer, and when they reported that they had reached an agreement, the report was received with cheers." On what this was, see L. and W., p. 22.

Is the unity demanded by Luther and our confession of church fellowship really also the unity in Eisenach? Even a cursory glance at the list of representatives forces everyone to deny this. W. Gußmann writes in the "Lutherisches Zeitblatt": "To one's great astonishment, one came across names that one had never before encountered in the ranks of conscious Lutherans, and even occasionally such names as the faithful congregation cannot remember without painful sighs." Not even all the delegates who appeared from America, together with their synods, were in church fellowship with one another! And of the Europeans, reports said: "All shades of Lutheranism were represented. If the distance between the individual representatives of Germany was already great, it was still greater among the representatives from abroad!" But in what then did the Eisenach unity consist?

Theodor Kaftan declared in 1908 that Christ was not God, but only mediator between God and men, and rejected prayer to JEsu as the Son of Man. (Free Church, p. 6.) Even in his "modern theology of the old faith" little remains of the old faith. At the World Convention, however, Kaftan was not merely recognized as a representative, but was made a member of the Committee on Resolutions. Is Kaftan considered exemplary of the nature of Eisenach unity?

During his visit to America, Söderblom was, with few exceptions, rejected by the Lutherans as a Unionist and a liberal heretic with whom to cultivate brotherhood of faith meant denial of Christianity. At the World Convention, Söderblom was a member of the Executive Committee, and as such took his place on the podium next to Ihmels, Knubel, Stub and others, and on Monday gave the welcoming address on behalf of the Scandinavian churches, in which he also spoke of edification "in common faith". Is a brotherhood real and true that is nurtured in Eisenach and denied in part by the same people in America? And was the unity at Eisenach really unity in the faith of the fathers, as is claimed, or in the faith of Söderblom?

Numerously represented in Eisenach were also the Union Lutherans from Prussia, Hesse, and Thuringia, all of whom, as is well known, are officially in church and communion with the Reformed and do nothing to break this unnatural connection, even defending it at the World Convention.6^) Was it the Lutheran

6) When in Eisenach the untenable position of the Verein Lutherans was pointed out by Church Councilor D. Nagel of Breslau and other members of the "Lutheran Federation" (who, of course, are also indirectly connected with Uniates), Director of Missions D. Knak of Berlin declared: "For a fundamental discussion of what has been said in recent speeches about the Lutherans in the Prussian Regional Church and about them, it is necessary at so late an hour

or the Uniate Faith, in which all World Convention members were united? And if one stood in "splendid unity" with the Union Lutherans, the Eisenach brotherly bond embraces, at least indirectly, also the brothers of these brothers: the Reformed and all Uniate, absorptive as well as confederate. What then may be the truth in which these are all united? Unity, as Luther demanded in Marburg in 1629, was certainly not the unity of Eisenach.

The same is to be judged with reference to the representatives from the Swedish Church, which since last year has been in full church and communion fellowship with the Anglicans and through them again with other churches.7) The situation is also substantially different

no more time. So, as a member of this church, I confine myself to the simple statement that, in spite of everything, I love my mother. This church is my mother, for she brought me to the Gospel, she taught me to believe, she made me a Lutheran, and on the mission field I know well Lutheran churches which are the daughter churches of this Lutheran Church of Prussia. If this church has been called a "political entity," that is hardly an accurate characterization of it. For it contradicts the experience which I and many other Lutherans in Prussia have had with her, and contradicts the facts on the mission field. No one has emphasized more strongly than Luther the sentence of the Sermon on the Mount that a rotten tree cannot bear good fruit. I think this simple confession of gratitude to our own Church at the close of the last meeting will not contradict the spirit of this Convention." (A. E. L. K., sp. 27.)

7) In the October number of the *Lutheran Church Review there* is the Response of the Swedish bishops to the "Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Church" by which full church communion has been established. The document is signed by Archbishop Söderblom and Bishops Billing and Daniel. According to the translation of the "Kirchenblatt" it says: "We are convinced that between our branches of the general Church of Christ, despite the *shades of opinion* which may exist, there is an essential unity in the fundamental conception which we have briefly presented, and to which we adhere unwaveringly. In this conviction we grasp the proffered hand with fraternal confidence. We rejoice in the decision of the Anglican Bishops, and on our part approve the practice that members of the Anglican Church, who are permitted to receive the Sacrament in their Church, shall be admitted to Holy Communion in ours; likewise that, on suitable occasions, Anglican ministers shall be permitted to preach and perform religious acts in our Churches." Church fellowship is also to be shown in the fact that bishops of both churches officiate together at episcopal ordinations. That doctrinal unity does not exist is admitted. Thus the Swedish Church denies that there is a difference of rank among ministers jure divino, as the Anglicans maintain. As to the Lord's Supper, in the Anglican Church the Reformed doctrine is held by some, and the Roman doctrine (transubstantiation) by others. The letter concludes: "May God bless this more intimate union of our churches which we are now instituting, and may the Church of JEsu Christ

not with the other representatives from the regional churches, because they all have Reformed and liberal false teachers in their midst, and the German ones, on top of that, are connected with the "German Protestant Church Federation" founded some years ago, which is composed of Lutherans, Reformed, Uniate, liberals, etc.8) Even the representatives of the United Lutheran Church were not entirely free from the threads of Reformed connections; for the latter also tolerates fellowship with sects and lodges and has official, though limited, connections with the Federal Council. Yes, even the people of the Lutheran Federation, who in turn identify themselves with Iowa and Ohio, have by no means burned all the bridges that connect them ecclesiastically and in terms of brotherhood with the national churches. The Eisenach brotherly bond thus embraces all kinds of brothers and brethren. Was really Luther's "one pure and sound doctrine" the truth in which they all agreed?

From the very beginning, the leaders of the World Convention were careful not to make their differences clear. Instead of facing reality, they buried their heads in the sand and declared, "We are united." Who also at Eisenach, the disagreement came out clearly enough in the lectures and negotiations. Apparently liberal debates, of course, do not seem to have been held. D. Stub says: "The Eisenach meeting was altogether of a conservative Lutheran character." *(L. C. H.,* Nov. 20, 1923.) In the interest of the practical result to be obtained, an effort was made to move along the most conservative lines possible. Even Söderblom, as later in America, knew how to strike orthodox-sounding notes. But not to be a modernist does not mean to be a faithful Lutheran. Even the theologians who are considered conservative in Europe have long since ceased to represent the Lutheranism of the Confessions. What they call the "old faith" is in many cases no longer the faith of the modernists.

in our countries reap from this union abundant fruit for their spiritual life! May we also in this way be better fitted to be instruments in the hand of God in forging the bond of unity and peace among the disciples of Christ throughout the world!" In the summer of 1920, the Lambeth Conference, consisting of the bishops of the Anglican Church, made the first motion to establish this church fellowship. The above reply of the Swedes bears the date, "Stockholm, April 21, 1922." In the same it is expressly stated that this agreement between the Swedes and the Anglicans does not allow any conclusions to be drawn about the American Augustana Synod and the Tamulian Lutheran Church in South India, since both are completely independent. (Luth. Church Review, 1923, p. 306.)

8) In his welcoming speech on Monday, Ihmels remarked: "People have asked anxiously whether we would not be an obstacle to the German Protestant Church Federation. There is no reason for this concern. We have in mind only such tasks as do not intersect with those of the German Church Federation." (Sp. 576)

Luther's. Even D. Melhorn writes in the *Lutheran:* "We were not so sanguine as to believe that all the representatives at that conference were in full accord with the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. We are well aware that teachers and authors and leaders in Lutheran centers have, in a measure, caught the infection of liberalism and modernism." Of pastors who are considered positive over there, D. Hein in *Pastors Monthly,* "I have reason to believe that those claiming to be Lutherans are not even one in what you and I would call Lutheran fundamentals." "What I heard regarding conversion was synergism." "I heard them speak of a Christ 'for us,' but from what I heard I came to the conclusion that some know not the Christ 'in our stead.'" To readers of "L. u. W." these are things long known. What a floral reading would be before us if all the European representatives had had full opportunity to develop their doctrinal views at Eisenach, to give them their best!

For all those who still have a sensorium for what is truly Lutheran, the disagreement at Eisenach is clear enough, as I said. With reference to the views presented by Bishop Raffey, for example, D. Reu: "It must have become evident that all kinds of Lutherans had come together for the World Convention." Gußmann writes in the "Lutherisches Zeitblatt": "We continued [in Eisenach] to emphasize the indispensability of the Lutheran Confession for the orderly existence of the Church, and in doing so carelessly passed by the fact that, at least as far as Germany is concerned, scarcely anything has been so deeply cornered, misjudged, disregarded, and set aside as the Confession of the Fathers." (55.) The catastrophic devaluation of all material values had long been preceded in Germany by the devaluation of all spiritual values, to which the Lutheran Confession belongs first and foremost. In ecclesiastical life it had fallen in price like the Mark in economic. Was there really to be a sudden reversal at Eisenach? Melhorn seems to think so. He writes in the *Lutheran,* "But somehow at Eisenach, when the subject was discussed, 'The Confession, the Indispensable Basis of the Lutheran Church,' there was not a sound or a voice that dared to lift itself in contradiction. All that was spoken rang true to that proposition. There was manifest at that conference a common- faith consciousness, which bound together in a holy alliance the representative units of twenty-two countries. They could sing, 'Blest be the tie that binds,' in a sense unknown to most other communions." But the speaker, D. Jörgensen, was himself the first to call everything into question again by his distinction of mobilia and immobilia in the confessions, and to abandon to the arbitrariness of theologians what he had beautifully said. (L. u. W., p. 18.) 9) If one lets the Confession

9) In Jörgensen's lecture it says, for example: "On the basis of the Lutheran confession it is possible, and therefore it should happen, that the

If the term "Lutheran" is to be composed of mobilia and immobilia, it has lost its meaning for the ecclesiastical judgment of what is Lutheran in doctrine and practice.

D. Reu especially emphasized the doctrines of original sin, the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, and the verbal inspiration. But how many members of the Convention agreed with him? took his side? In the unanimously adopted confessional resolution the Berbalinspiration is not expressed, is it therefore actually rejected. (L. and W., p. 20.) D. Hein writes: "Such a resolution [that the Scriptures are inspired in all parts] could never have been adopted unanimously. Many, I am quite certain almost the majority, would have objected." [10]) "Almost the majority," means Hein! It is generally known of Ihmels and the majority of German theologians and pastors that they have long since abandoned the literal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. The same is true even of the Breslau Free Church. And in the "Lutherisches Zeitblatt" of January, W. Guhmann now also writes: the time of verbal inspiration has long since expired, and to the American brethren one must "declare clearly and roundly: We cannot turn the wheel of history backwards

national and personal enemies are gathering. It has already happened in these days. And now that we have found each other, you from Central Europe, we from the North, you from across the great sea, all of us who have fought against each other: now that, I say, we have found each other here in the heart of Europe - for Wittenberg and Wartburg are the heart of Europe - we must never again forget that our churches have a common foundation. For the first time we have found each other, and this first time must not be the last. How firmly did not our fathers stand together in the sixteenth century! Let us think, for example, of the signatures of the denomination! Or let us think - what is even more significant - that Lutherans everywhere adopted the Confessio Augustana! In Denmark, for example, we had a splendid Evangelical Lutheran confession, the Copenhagen Articles, written in 1530; but this confession was later dropped in order to adopt the Confessio Augustana. So now we must also stand together. And as then there was intercourse between the Lutherans-as, for example, Denmark sent its best men, Hans Taufen, Petrus Palladius, and others, to Wittenberg, and Wittenberg again sent Bugenhagen to Copenhagen-so also in the twentieth century the intercourse between the Lutherans must become more lively." (A. E. L. K. 1923, sp. 755.)

10) In *Pastor's Monthly* Hein writes: "Not only in Eisenach, as the result of private conversations, but also at a conference of Lutheran pastors that I attended in another city, I came to the conclusion that the attitude of many of these men toward the Holy Scriptures is not that of the Lutheran Church. To them the Scriptures are the inspired Word of God only in those parts which contain divine revelations as to man's salvation, and it is a Christian's personal experience that determines whether or not a certain part of the Scriptures is God's Word."

turn!" The "Zeitblatt" is the organ of the Lutheran League, whose members, as reported above, have especially promised themselves much blessing from Reu's and Hein's debates. If now they too begin to back away, how many of the German representatives will remain who are really in agreement with Reu and Hein?

Is it possible to name any important doctrine of our Confession and any main point of Lutheran practice on which all members of the Convention or even a majority of them were really in agreement? For the whole of German theology is such that theologians of Scripture, theologians who let themselves be determined in their judgment solely by the clear word of Scripture, must reject it in toto. Especially with reference to the theological character of the lectures given in Eisenach, Gußmann rightly remarks: "A theology of Scripture, such as the Americans cultivate, based on the fundamental premise of verbal inspiration, does not exist at all in Germany at present." (55.) Where, then, is the glory of the Eisenach Unity? Does it not resemble a parody of Luther's words: "One and the same pure and truthful doctrine of the Gospel and outward confession of the same in all places of the world and at all times"? The whole World Convention, as planned and held, bears the stamp of the spurious, untrue, and un-Lutheran. Under the veil of brotherly fellowship, Babylonian confusion was concealed in Eisenach with regard to truly Lutheran doctrine and practice.

This also answers the question why we Missourians did not participate in Eisenach. We can understand that people who take the unionist position of the United Lutheran Church could also maintain church fellowship with false teachers and indifferentists in Europe and feel that they are in their element. This becomes more difficult when one thinks of spirits like Söderblom. But we cannot understand how these churchmen could indulge in the delusion that the unity of Eisenach is precisely the unity which Luther and the Lutheran confession mean. We cannot understand why they do not openly declare that they think differently from Luther and the Confession on this point. Finally, we also cannot understand how they could expect our Synod, which, as everyone knows, also holds fast to the old Lutheran position with regard to church fellowship, to misrepresent the un-Lutheran, inauthentic nature in Eisenach.

In the "Lutherisches Zeitblatt" Gußmann writes: "There was something wonderful about the bond of peace that entwined the assemblies in Eisenach. All tensions seemed resolved, all discord buried. In the midst of a world filled with hatred and riddled with demonic passions, a silent sport of peace, in spite of the world war and the lie of war, a community of believers on which lay something of the lovely radiance of the first Pentecost! But those who looked more closely noticed

to his not insignificant astonishment that the World Convention contained within its bosom contradictions of which we had not hitherto been aware to the same extent. . . . Besides the historically founded differences, however, disputes also came to light which do not remotely deserve the name. We heard with new uneasiness that there is no pulpit and altar fellowship between the United Lutheran Church of North America and individual synods represented in Eisenach [Ohio and Iowa], indeed that synodal competition, that ugly outgrowth on the body of American church polity, has led in part to the erection of counter-altars in one and the same place. sIn St. Louis, for example, the United Lutheran Church is endeavoring to form opposition congregations from lodge members who cannot be accepted here.j But these are untenable conditions. We cannot sit at the same table as brethren in the faith at the World Convention and then go out and fight each other again as enemies. That would be to degrade the Convention to a hollow showpiece! Whether similar reefs exist in the Nordic churches, I do not exactly know. In any case, the relationship between Germans, Latvians and Estonians in the old Baltic country is not the best. And Germany, too, has no reason to boast, as every connoisseur knows and I need not elaborate. Here, therefore, the will for a thorough change must break through, if the Lutheran World Convention is not to be burdened from the outset with the stain of inner untruthfulness."

We do not dispute this, but believe that it also applies to the unreal fellowship in Eisenach among people who claimed unity in the faith of the fathers and yet were nothing less than truly united. If, according to Gußmann, it already involves untruthfulness when Americans in Eisenach associate fraternally with one another who are not in church fellowship at home, what must then be the verdict on the Eisenach unity with Söderblom, Kaftan, and Lutherans of all shades? These differences in doctrine and practice, of course, do not seem to be of much concern to Gußmann. But we Missourians - without denial of divine truth, without disobedience to the serious admonitions of Scripture concerning conduct toward false teachers, without disloyalty to the principles of the Lutheran confession concerning godly church fellowship, without great annoyance to the church, and also without staining our consciences by untruthfulness and hypocrisy, we Missourians, at any rate, could not have participated in Eisenach programmatically. F. B.

(Conclusion

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From the Synod. Both the entire St. Louis faculty and individual members of it not infrequently receive inquiries as to where in "Doctrine and Discipline" treatises on questions of Christian doctrine and practice are to be found. It is sometimes difficult to give satisfactory answers to these inquiries, even for those members of the faculty who have been active in the editorial work for several decades. We therefore feel that there is a need to produce a Gefamtregifter for our theological journal, which this year has entered its seventieth year. The need for such a register arose earlier. At the end of the 10th volume (1864) we find an index prepared by Blessed Father Kehl, Sr. which covers volumes 6 to 10. In 1884 another register appeared, covering vintages 1 to 28. If our memory does not deceive us, this register was made by some members of the Chicago Pastoral Conference. How would it be now if one or more pastoral conferences, or even individual members of the ministry, would undertake to produce an index covering vintages 1 to 70? The work is an extensive one. But it would certainly be welcomed by a large part of our ministry. The work should also be both interesting and instructive to those who undertake it. The register should also not leave out the ecclesiastical and contemporary historical part. In this part of our theological monthly we find the most complete church history of the last seventy years in a concrete presentation with an appended evaluation from God's Word. - How such an index would look like, may be illustrated by a few samples from the index, which comprises the first 28 volumes: "Justification, the Apostle James' doctrine thereof 1, 117. 140; shall no longer be fundamental 3, 316; Theses 4, 9; how to preach 7, 43. 75; Lutheran doctrine of it 13, 76; 21, 80; false doctrine of Hengstenberg 13, 234; Brenz and Melanchthon of it 14, 214; in a French conference 14, 325; on two axioms 16, 353; dispute of the Norwegian and Augustan synods 17, 145; Catholic and Protestant doctrine 18, 352; dispute about it: Löhe, Hörger, Ströbel 21, 329; *Observer* on Luther's doctrine 21, 375; Methodists against it 22, 91; justification and election by grace 26, 353. 361." - "**Naturwissenschast** und Theologie, influence 5, 43; testimony for the existence of God 6, 183; against the history of creation 7, 39. 68. 98; its conclusions about Greenland 13, 376; its abuse 16, 154." - "**Flörke, A. W.** , the doctrine of the millennial kingdom r [review] 7, 264; 1 20, 352; its retraction 10, 128." F. P.

In the "Gemeindeblatt"**,** the synodal organ of the Wisconsin Synod, we find excellent remarks **about the "individual chalice",** of which we give the following here. It says: "The use of the individual chalice, that is, the giving of a special cup to each individual communicant, has been in use in some church communities for some time, but is foreign to the Lutheran Church. The doctrine of the deadly disease bacillus does not seem important enough to us so far that we should give up the communal cup because of it. The common

The single chalice is a symbol of the communion which we have among ourselves as Christians and which finds its highest expression precisely in the sacrament and is especially cultivated and strengthened in the communal partaking of the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour. Not as if the use of the single chalice in itself cancels the sacrament. But we do not like to let the beautiful sense, the edification, which lies precisely in the use of the communal cup, be disturbed by petty concerns. The case of a sick communicant going to communion and transmitting his illness to other communicants, if it ever occurs at all, is so infinitesimally rare that it hardly seems worthy of our notice. This is not to pronounce a condemnatory sentence on a congregation which introduces the single cup, as is said to have happened here and there in Lutheran congregations, whether they use it for all communicants or only for those who desire it for their own persons. But the germ which the church has especially to fear to-day is the germ of indifference, which does not value the good we have, and which kills true life, and which is highly transmissible. What do you think of the sacrament at all? Is it to thee only a pious exercise which, as a Christian, thou hast to undergo a few times a year, or is it to thee a banquet of grace, of God's love, of intimate communion with thy Saviour and Church, of comfort, of strengthening, of peace, and of joy? Is it to you a work of law which you think you must perform in order to make yourself worthy of God's favour, or is it to you the voice of Him who says, "Him that cometh to me I will not cast out. Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. Drink of it, all of you; this is my blood which is poured out for you'? That is the great supper question." - We would add the following: Concerning the "deadly disease bacillus," "Doctrine and Discipline" has repeatedly brought medical verdicts on the same. American and English physicians have made investigations and reported as a result that they could not trace a single case of infection to the communion cup. A greater danger of infection than in the communion cup lies in the communal lust which we cannot help breathing in our public worship services and on other occasions. Communal pleasure brings us more or less into contact with our inner being, especially with the respiratory organs of our neighbor, whereas in the communal communion cup there is only more external contact. In smaller churches, as well as in larger ones, especially when they are full of people, we soon notice the sensation of pleasure caused by the breathing of those present. Yet we do not think in the least of stopping our public services and meetings. - Why do we mention these things here? Because it is quite proper for the pastor to speak of these things even in and with the congregation, when some members of the congregation, fearing the germ that lurks in the communion cup, insist on the individual cup. Nor is it unseemly to remind individuals, and in some circumstances the whole congregation, how careful the pastor is to keep away from the distribution of the cup anything that might cause offence or distaste. The pastor has already been trained in these external things in the theological institution Wohl. Compare what e.g. Walther

says: "The administrator does well if he turns the chalice before each subsequent administration of the blessed wine, so that the next communicant does not have to touch the chalice at the same place where the first one before him took it to his mouth. Persons with a feeding defect of the lip or mouth are to be caused to take communion privately until cured." (Pastorale, p. 185 f.) There is also a straining spoon and a clean cloth on the altar. With the sieve spoon the pastor immediately removes whatever may have fallen into the chalice, and with the cloth he keeps the rim of the chalice clean. If we still want to say that we do not trust the matter of cleanliness, we would like to remind you that there is again an inconsistency here. Many of us eat more or less off the menu in restaurants, hotels, and dining cars without any particular concern, although we can trust the service personnel who handle the food much less than we can trust our well-trained and conscientious pastors. So much about this point. It has become more under the table than was intended. But it may help to shorten longer negotiations, if some excitement should be impending in this or that congregation by pressing for the single cup. But one more point should be pointed out, which is apt to ward off germophobia. The giver of Holy Communion, the all-knowing Son of God, knew more about germs and their transmissibility than we humans will ever know. And yet he did not let this stop him from using the communal cup. - We also approve of the "Gemeindeblatt's" reference to the fact that the communal cup is an outward sign or image of the spiritual fellowship which we have among ourselves as Christians. Finally, we should remember that not in all, but in some cases, the insistence on the individual cup is based on the desire to accommodate ourselves to sectarian churches that we may have in close proximity. But this accommodation is certainly out of place, since we know that the Reformed sects have no Lord's Supper at all, because they deny the words of the Lord's Supper. (Cf. Formula of Concord, M. 653, 32;
P. 982.) F. P.

II. foreign countries.

Verbal Inspiration, Doctrinal Unity and World Covenant. The "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt", organ of the Lutheran Federation, brings in its January issue "Some Thoughts on the Lutheran World Convention" by W. Gußmann. In them he also expresses himself about verbal inspiration and doctrinal unity. Gußmann finds the wish expressed in Eisenach that German theology should submit its position on Scripture to a revision "not unobjectionable." "To the divine inspiration of Holy Scripture," he declares, "we all profess." But it is essentially different with the verbal inspiration. In Germany, he says, there is a firm conviction that its time has long since expired. Gußmann writes: "Through the continued attacks [of biblical criticism] we have been compelled to occupy ourselves much more thoroughly than our fathers did with the actual nature of the individual biblical books, and we now know that it is the Scriptures in their given constitution that contradict the verbal inspiration. It is not, therefore, unbelief nor little faith, but the simple dictate of a factual Ge-

The most serious knowledge, if we explain to the American brothers clearly and roundly: We cannot turn the wheel of history backwards!" Concerning doctrinal unity, Gußmann remarks: "In truth, theology is a changing quantity. It is confronted with an infinite task, which it is always able to master only approximately in ever new attempts." It should therefore not be condemned to standstill. "Even the World Convention cannot ignore this fact," says Gußmann. If, for example, it wanted to stamp verbal inspiration as the shiboleth of its members, it "would throw the incendiary torch of theological doctrinal disputes into the newly built house and bring its own history to an abrupt end before it has even quite begun. Theological doctrinal disagreements are . . . something quite unavoidable". Such tensions must therefore be resolved by the World Convention into a "harmonious coexistence". In context, Gußmann's statements read as follows: "From the American side the request was made directly and indirectly in Eisenach that German theology should submit its position on Scripture to a revision. How this request was to be understood was not long left uncertain. According to the various confessions which our American brethren made with a creditable straightforwardness and frankness, it could not have been anything less than a determined return to the old orthodox doctrine of verbal inspiration. There was no reply from the German side, probably for the simple reason that most of the German theologians present had to say to themselves that such a difficult and intricate question could not be settled in an hour by a longer or shorter heartfelt declaration off the cuff. But this does not, of course, eliminate the contradiction. What we encountered in Eisenach in the way of American theology showed such a uniform and united attitude, characterized precisely by standing on the verbal inspiration, that the desire was, and still is, too obvious to see German theology included in this alliance of a solid biblicism. Not only the strongly developed self-confidence of a youthfully aspiring church, as reflected e.g. in the programmatic sentences of the immortalized D. Lauritz Larsen, urges this: 'Christianity is the conscience of the world. Protestantism is the conscience of Christianity. Lutheranism is the conscience of Protestantism. American Lutheranism is the conscience of Lutheranism', but certainly already the fraternal desire of the American theologians to know themselves to be wholeheartedly at one with their German working comrades in the most sacred and all-necessary thing they themselves know, the authority of the infallible Word of God. My, however easily we may comprehend this desire, and however certainly we must admit on our part that the position of German theology with respect to Scripture presents a very sore point which urgently needs clarification: in the end, nevertheless, we have no choice but to find it not unobjectionable. - Inspiration and verbal inspiration are two very different terms, the former of a religious, the latter of a theological nature. To inspiration, that is, to the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, we all profess. Whoever wished to depart from this main and fundamental article of our Church would no longer be a Lutheran Christian and could claim no place in the ranks of the Lutheran World Convention. On the other hand, the situation is considerably different with regard to verbal inspiration, that is, with regard to the doctrine of orthodox dogmatics.

from the literal inspiration of the biblical books. This theory goes far beyond the simple fact of faith (faith adheres to the clear words of Scripture, e. g. to the word of Jesus: "Scripture cannot be broken"!), believes that it can illuminate the most secret processes of divine inspiration - no such foolishness and presumption has ever occurred to the Lutheran dogmatists! and establishes a whole number of specific, sharply formulated doctrines. That genuine Christian motives underlie this theory cannot be denied. I personally think very highly of them, so that in this respect I know myself to be entirely at one [?l] with the testimony of Prof. D. M. Reu. On the other hand, however, it must not be disregarded that the theory was intended to meet the demands of a reason l?! trained according to all the rules of syllogistic logic. And thus its verdict is already pronounced: it does not and cannot perform what it promises to perform. For like all human knowledge, theological knowledge is also piecemeal. God's miraculous creations are far too high and lofty to be harnessed to the meagre scaffolding of deducted concepts and conclusions. Thus also the how of the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures will always remain a mystery for the thinking mind, from which eternity must first lift the last veil. - In addition to this, every theological theory is conditioned by contemporary history. It works with the means and according to the methods of a narrowly limited intellectual period. With it it blossoms, with it it withers, and finally falls like a dry leaf from a branch. Accordingly, we in Germany live in the firm conviction that the time of verbal inspiration has long since expired. It is not in vain that we have wandered for a whole century through the flames of biblical criticism. In this hard school we have not only become more modest, so that we reverence the divine mysteries in faith, but consider all dogmatic theories to be something provisional, which will soon be obsolete, but above all we have also learned to see. Through continued attacks we have been compelled to look much more closely than our fathers did into the actual nature of the individual biblical books, and now know that it is the Scriptures themselves, in their given constitution, which contradict the verbal inspiration. It is not, therefore, unbelief nor small faith, but the simple dictate of a matter-of-fact earnestness of conscience, when we declare clearly and roundly to the American brethren: We cannot turn the wheel of history backwards! Our goal is before us, not behind us. We have a new theory of inspiration to work out, and perhaps the Spirit who guides the Church of Christ into all truth will give it to us, if the other longing is fulfilled which found such lively expression at Eisenach: the longing for a new and deeper interpretation of Scripture. - Almost stronger concerns than the inner impossibility of the expressed request, however, are aroused by the idea, emerging in the background, as if there were something like a Lutheran standard theology to which every theologian of Lutheran character would have to adhere and to which, therefore, the Lutheran World Convention would have to commit itself first and foremost. Here, too, a distinction must be made. There are certainly binding norms of life for every Lutheran theology, which it may not violate with impunity. It must be scriptural and confessional. Otherwise it has no right to

to exist on Lutheran soil. It is quite another matter, however, if a certain theological doctrinal form of past centuries is to be elevated to the status of a normal type that can claim validity for all times, peoples and languages. And this is what it is about when the return to the doctrine of orthodox dogmatics of the literal inspiration of Holy Scripture is recommended with such urgency. In truth, theology is a changing quantity. It is confronted with an infinite task, which it is always able to master only approximately, in ever new attempts. Whoever, therefore, wished to fix it at any stage of its historical development, would condemn it to standstill, and thereby at the same time cut its very lifeline, the never-resting, undauntedly pressing forward work. But even the World Convention cannot ignore this fact. As soon as it favoured the attempt to make the theory of verbal inspiration the shibboleth of its members, it would throw the torch of theological doctrinal disputes into the newly built house and bring its own history to an abrupt end before it had even begun. Theological doctrinal disagreements are quite unavoidable in view of the diversity of the paths that the Lord has taken with the individual provinces of the Lutheran Church as a whole. We have to accept them as a given and may even rejoice in them as part of our spiritual riches. The World Convention, however, which is not a congress of theologians but an ecclesial assembly, must seek its point of unity not in this or that theological doctrine, but in the faith and confession of the church, which is true to Scripture. The more consciously it adheres to this heritage and the more assiduously it proliferates with it, the more surely it will also get over the theological tensions and resolve them, instead of hostile opposition, into a harmonious coexistence." (pp. 57 ff.) As is well known, the Breslauers have long since bidden farewell to the doctrine of the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. Now the "Lutheran League" also seems to be falling over. At any rate, the editors of its "Zeitblatt" have not found a word to criticize Gußmann's thoughts, which are everywhere moving in modern un-Lutheran directions. Should it really have already come to the point that (apart from our brethren in the Free Church of Saxony, etc.) not a single ecclesiastical association can be found in all of Germany which still publicly and decisively advocates that the Scriptures are the literally inspired and therefore infallible Word of God? F. B.

The atheist Fritz Mauthner, poet and philosopher**, who died on 28 June last,** was buried in Meersburg on Lake Constance in the "Protestant" church there by the "Protestant" pastor Dr. Waidmann from Keßweil (Switzerland). The text was formed by the words of Mauthner: "A sun has set." "He remained true to the advice," said Waidmann, "which one of his teachers in Prague once gave him: 'Preserve as long as possible the love of flowers and butterflies and of all nature: that is the love of God.'" Before his death one saw from his countenance his soul smiling out of pure love of the Divine . . . . Mauthner's life-work will shine; and whoever falls into this light and into the circle of fire of his being will always be captivated by it." What a lumpening of the Church, where such things are possible! F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Year 70. **April 1924.** **No. 4.**

The year 1524

is, so to speak, the year of birth of the Lutheran hymnal^ which celebrates its anniversary this year, that of four hundred years of existence.

I. In 1524, a booklet of only twelve quarto leaves appeared with the title: "Etlich Cristlich lider | Lobgesang, vnd Psalm, dem rai- | nen Wort Gottes gemetz, auß der | heyligen schrifft, durch mancher- | ley hochgelehrter gemacht, in der, Kirchen zu singen, wie es dann | zum tayl berayt zu Wittenberg | in Übung ist. | Wittenberg MDXXIIII."

This booklet contains eight songs: 1. nun freut euch, lieben Christen g'mein. 2. salvation has come to us. 3. in God I believe that He created heaven and earth from nothing, etc. (nine stanzas of twelve lines each). (nine stanzas of twelve lines each.) 4. Help, God, how is the misery of man so great, who can tell it all (six stanzas of twelve lines each.) 5. Oh God, look in from heaven. 6. the mouth of the unwise speaks well. 7. out of deep distress I cry to you. 8. in Jesus' name we lift up the best we have learned [nineteen stanzas of five lines each].

The first song of Luther has his name and the signature 1523. The three songs of D. Speratus (No. 2, 3 and 4) also have his name, No. 2 with the signature "Wittenberg 1523", No. 3 and 4 "Wittenberg 1524". The songs nos. 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 are provided with single-voice song notes, to which the beginning of the song, the first line, is printed each time.

Dr. K. E. P. Wackernagel also mentions two very similar prints from 1524 with the same title and content, but he does not consider them to be Wittenberg prints either, but Nuremberg prints.

II. It further appeared in 1524 (and I give the titles hereafter in the modern spelling): "Enchiridion, or a little handbook, almost useful for every Christian to have with him, for constant practice and contemplation of spiritual chants and psalms; righteous

and artificially Germanized. 1524 "At the end of this booklet you will find an index in which it is clearly indicated what and how many songs are included. With these and similar hymns one should educate the young youth."

This booklet contains three sheets in small octavo and is printed in Erfurt. It contains 25 songs, namely, besides the above eight songs also: "Dies sind die heil'gen zehn Gebot'", "Mitten wir im Leben sind", "Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeiet", "Gelobet sei du, JEsu Christ", "HErr Christ, der einig' Gott'ssohn", "JEsus Christus, unser Heiland", "Wohl dem, der in Gotts Furchtte steht", "Wo Gott der HErr nicht bei uns hält", "Have mercy on me, O Lord God", "God will be merciful to us", "Christ lay in bands of death", "Come, Creator God, Holy Spirit", "Come, Holy Spirit, Lord God", "Nu komm, der Heiden Heiland", "Christum wir sollen loben schon", "Ein neues Lied wir heben an".

So nineteen songs by Luther and three by Speratus. This hymnal is the first with a preface. It reads as follows: "To all Christians be grace and peace from God our Lord always. Amen. Among the many abuses hitherto denounced by many learned and experienced men of the Holy Scriptures, this one, of course, is not the least in truth, which our temple servants and the devil's choristers have highly decorated for divine service, namely, that they alone have stood all day in the choir and, after the manner of the priests of Baal, have roared with inarticulate cries, and still roar in monasteries, churches, and convents like forest asses to a deaf God. Not only to their own detriment, because they themselves often do not understand what they sing or read, but also to the detriment of the whole Christian community. Because, then, according to the teaching of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14, nothing is to be done in the congregation of the Christian people in singing and reading, except for the betterment by interpretation, and such pretended worship, hitherto performed by the ungodly temple servants, does nothing for the betterment of the congregation of Christ. For only that they should be mocked, as Elias mocked the priests of Baal, when he spake unto them: "Shout aloud! Baal is a god,' as ye suppose him to say. He is writing poetry, or he is at work, or he is in the field, or perhaps he is asleep; that he may awake. Who there was neither voice nor answer, saith the Scripture, Revelation 18: So also our temple people suppose that our God (to whom the inward thoughts of man's heart are otherwise manifest) will be honored with great clamor, and crieth out without all understanding and correction, even as if he would break himself, neither without blaspheming the divine Scriptures and the holy Psalms. To correct such abuses, however, it is the Christian order in many places to sing German spiritual songs and psalms, so that even the common Christian may be able to hear them.

The first is that the people may in time learn to understand what is done among the congregation in singing and reading. And secondly, that the bees' sore in the temples may henceforth cease, there are written in this booklet some common and almost well-founded songs in the Holy Scriptures, which every Christian ought to have with him and carry with him for constant practice, in which also the children may be brought up and instructed in time, regardless of what the ungodly, selfish temple servants will blaspheme against it, because this exists with God's Word, but their sore is set against God's Word. God be with all lovers of Christian order always! Amen."

Wackernagel also lists two other Ersurt printings of this "Enchiridion" from the year 1524, which indicates how widespread Luther's songs were in Erfurt. In these printings, too, many of the hymns have single-voice song notes.

III From the next year, 1525, comes the following print: "Geistliches Gesangbüchlein, erstlich zu Wittenberg und folgend durch Peter Schöffern gedruckt, im Jahr 1525." It has five parts, according to the five voices, tenor, treble, alto, bass, and vagante (second tenor). The format is small quarto. On the verso of the last leaf of the alto part, which is otherwise blank, are the words "Autore loanne Waithero." It contains 38 numbers and the following preface by Luther: "That singing spiritual songs is good and pleasing to God, I respect, is not hidden from any Christian, because not only the example of the prophets and kings in the Old Testament (who praised God with singing and sounding, with poetry and all kinds of string playing), but also such custom, especially with psalms, is known to common Christianity from the beginning. St. Paul also uses this in 1 Corinthians 14 and tells the Colossians to sing spiritual songs and psalms to the Lord from the heart, so that God's word and Christian doctrine may be practiced in all ways. Accordingly I have also, with others, for a good beginning, and to give cause to them that are better able, gathered together some spiritual songs, to promote and to bring into pregnancy the holy gospel, which is now risen again by the grace of God, that we also may boast, as Moses did in his song (Ex. 15), that Christ is our praise and song, and that we should know nothing to sing nor to speak but Jesus Christ our Saviour, as Paul saith 1 Cor. 2. 2 And they are also written in four voices, not for any other reason than that I would like the youth, who otherwise should and must be educated in *music* and other proper arts, to have something so that they can get rid of boorish songs and carnal chants and learn something wholesome instead, and thus enter into the good things with pleasure, as is fitting for the young. Neither am I of opinion that all arts should be beaten to the ground by the gospel.

and perish, as some super-spiritual ones pretend, but I would like to see all arts, especially music, in the service of him who gave and created them. Therefore, I ask that every pious Christian let such things please him and, where God gives him more or the like, help to promote them. Otherwise, alas, all the world is too lax and too forgetful to draw and teach the poor youth, that one must not first of all also give cause for it. God give us his grace! Amen."

IV. Well, this appeal of Luther to collaborators in the field of hymnody was not in vain. Wackernagel enumerates from 1525 to the year 1533 no less than forty hymnals of Lutheran origin, some without, some with indication of the place of printing (Nuremberg, Erfurt, Breslau, Zwickau, Strasburg, Wittenberg, Augsburg, "Zum jungen Bunzel in Böhmen"). They contain up to 146 songs; some are only small and bring new songs; others give "sacred German hymn and song' of every festival, over the whole year . . . to be sung in churches or elsewhere devoutly, comfortably, and more conveniently." One gives already in 1526 on twelve half sheets in octavo in Low German language "Eyn gantz schone unde sehr nutte ghesangboek, tho dagelyker övinge geistliker gesenge vund Psalmen ... in Sassischer Sprake klarer wen to vorn verdudeschet vnd mit flyte gedruckt", which already points to an earlier collection of Low German songs. Some offer only the text, others also the notes, at the same time as the notes for the local liturgy in the order of service and communion. The hymn "Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott," composed by Luther in 1530 "at Koburg during the Diet of Augsburg," is found (according to Wackernagel) "first printed in the hymnal of 1531, then in a second edition of this (Strasbourg?) hymnal from 1533. In the latter year, Luther gave the Wittenberg hymnal, in addition to the old one, a new preface, which, significantly enough, reads: "Now some have proven themselves to be good and have increased the songs, so that they surpass me by far and are my masters in this respect. But in addition, the others have done little good. And because I see that the daily work, without all distinction, as each one thinks good, will become no measure, beyond that, that even the first of our songs are printed the longer, the more falsified, I am worried that this booklet will run out of length, as it has always happened to good books, that they are so completely overwhelmed and devastated by the addition of unskilled heads, that one has lost the good underneath and only kept the useless in use. As we see in the first chapter of St. Luke, that in the beginning every man wanted to write a gospel, until the right gospel was almost lost among so many gospels. The same happened to St. Jerome and St. Augustine and many other books. In sum, there is always a mice's dung among the pepper. So that

now that, as much as we like, may perish [=be forestalled], I have again overlooked this booklet anew and set our songs together one after the other with expressed names, which I previously avoided for the sake of glory, but now must do out of necessity, so that foreign, unfit songs would not be sold under our name. After this the others are added, which we consider the best and most useful. Please and admonish all who love the pure word not to improve or increase our booklet any more without our knowledge and will. But if it were to be improved without our knowledge, that it might be known that it was not our booklet issued in Wittenberg. But each of us can compile his own booklet full of songs and leave ours alone, as we ask, desire, and herewith want to have it testified. For we also like to keep our coin in our dignity; no one begrudges to make a better one for himself, so that God's name alone may be praised and our name not sought. Amen."

This is what happened during the creation of the Lutheran hymnal, which actually made the Lutheran church a singing church. It might seem strange that with the many thousands of copies of Lutheran hymnals that circulated in the Lutheran congregations during Luther's lifetime, one encounters so seldom one on the antiquarian book market, and then only at horrendous prices; but it can be understood: the small books probably remained mostly unbound and have become quite worn and unsightly through much use, like Luther's Small Catechism of 1529

.

Zwingli as a pioneer of modernity.

As is well known, Luther has also been held responsible for modern unbelief and general apostasy from Christianity. This has been done especially by his professional detractors, the Jesuits, who, like the popes themselves, tend to derive all the troubles in church, home, and state from Luther's apostasy from the papacy, which they falsely interpret as an apostasy from Christianity. Liberal theologians have also repeatedly attempted to trace their lineage back to Luther. Everyone just likes to adorn themselves with their great name. But now, as is well known, their verdict has long since changed to the other, admittedly just as false one: Luther was stuck in the papacy, in the Middle Ages - an accusation that, by the way, was already raised by Anabaptists, Reformed and others at the time of the Reformation. What the liberals want to say with this is that Luther, while in

He said that he had overthrown the authority of the pope in matters of faith, but not with reason as the supreme principle of truth, but with Scripture, which he had aligned as the new authority, exalted even above reason and science. And this is in accordance with the facts. In the face of all reason, that of the Pope and the priests as well as that of the enthusiasts, Luther asserted, in matters of doctrine, Scripture alone, theoretically as well as practically. Luther was always, everywhere and in every respect a theologian who accepted only one authority: the clear Word of God. No line leads from Luther either to the vulgar or to the new rationalists. Nowhere in his theology is there even the slightest approach that could have developed into modernism. The liberals have Luther as little for a father as the Pharisees have Abraham.

The situation is different with Zwingli. He belongs to the pioneers of rationalism. Modernists can rightly look up to him as one of their ancestors. From him leads more than one path to modern liberalism with its unbelief as well as social goals. Reasonableness and this-worldliness, as is well known, are the two main features of modernity. Zwingli already has more than mere beginnings of both. According to him, for example, Christ is said to have instituted nothing in the Lord's Supper "which is inconsistent with reason." "To believe unreasonable things," he says, God requires of no one. And one of his chief duties Zwingli saw in all sorts of social and political reforms. Zwingli was modern, modern in the liberal sense of the word. The supremacy of reason and the social aim of work, these two traits of Zwingli's character were probably also primarily what Luther had in mind when he declared at Marburg: "You have a different spirit from ours."

This difference between Luther's and Zwingli's way of thinking has often been pointed out, also in "Lehre und Wehre". In Germany this was done again last year by Prof. W. Köhler in his work "Huldreich Zwingli". What lends special interest to his judgment is the circumstance that he himself is a Reformed Swiss and liberal theologian. The "A. E. L. K." of last year (p. 391) remarks with reference to Köhler and his writing: ".Ihr habt einen andern Geist/ This word of Luther to Zwingli at the religious discussion in Marburg has often been suspected of stubbornness on the part of the Reformer, and those who defended him because of it were looked upon askance. An unexpected witness now for Luther is the just published writing "Huldreich Zwingli' by Prof. W. Köhler (Leipzig 1923, Hässel; 94 p. small octavo). Köhler, a liberal theologian and pronounced admirer of Zwingli, admires in him the pioneer of modernity in comparison with the backward Luther. His final judgment is exceedingly instructive, so that we reproduce it in full." We, too, let the interesting characterization follow here, but with it we want to

not, of course, having already given our placet to every historical and' theological judgement)

1) How little weight the "A. E. L. K." seems to place on the differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed is evident from a later statement in which it says, among other things: "A dear friend in Switzerland took offense at the article 'You have a different spirit', as if we wanted to renew the seventeenth century with its bitter polemics against the Reformed. We do not think of it; we have also repeatedly said how the times have changed, how the Lutherans caught songs of the Reformed (Tersteegen) without further ado, and the Reformed songs of Luther. Much giving has taken place over and over again, and continues to take place for the blessing of both, without our needing to give away or forget the least of the inherited treasures of Luther's Reformation." (Sp. 462.) As far as Luther's Marburg word is concerned, he thus only gave expression to a fact of serious consequence. But it did not become momentous only because Luther stated it. Had he not done so, it would have become much more disastrous. It could then have brought forth its last evil fruits immediately and unhindered. The fact is that the theology of Luther and Zwingli differs like the word of God and the joke of man. Luther lives and weaves in the thoughts of Scripture, while Zwingli, following his reason, sets out on paths which finally lead back to paganism and modern unbelief. This fact brings Luther's word to brief, clear expression. He could not judge otherwise. Whoever reproaches Luther from this is asking of him nothing less than untruthfulness and denial of the truth. In his vague and in every respect unreliable, un-Lutheran writing Christian Fellowship, Söderblom writes: "On the other hand, he [Luther] opposed Zwingli at Marburg unreasonably and unhappily, although they both belonged to the movement of reform. At Marburg Luther was not conscious of different types of religion, but he thought he perceived a different spirit in the others. It meant that, justly or unjustly, he missed in them the all-devouring religious passion that filled his own soul." (34.) (34.) This is also historically wrong. "I have been a student of Luther during my whole investigation of religion," asserts Söderblom. Then he is just one of the many who always study and yet learn nothing. Incidentally, Söderblom too, without being untruthful, can only hold his position as Lutheran archbishop if he also shares the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. If he shares it, how can he then reproach Luther for having opposed Zwingli "unreasonably and unhappily"? He who loves truthfulness cannot expect Luther, the man with the Worms "I cannot help it," to deny the truth in Marburg, to abandon the Scriptural principle, to allow rationalism to prevail, and to paper over the whole gulf that gaped here. There are, after all, even among the Reformed people who at least appreciate Luther's faithfulness to conviction. Among these" is D. Machen of Princeton, a champion of the fundamentalists in their desperate struggle to free themselves from the deadly entanglements of the moderns. Referring to the Marburg Word, Machen, writing last year on Christianity and Liberalism, says: "It was a great calamity [the breach between the Lutherans and the Reformed branches of the Church at Marburg]. But the calamity was due to the fact that Luther (as we believe) was wrong about the Lord's Supper; and it would have been a far greater calamity if, being wrong about the Supper, he had represented the whole question as a trifling affair. Luther was wrong about the Supper, but not nearly as wrong as he would have been if, being wrong, he had said to his opponents: 'Brethren, this matter is a trifle; and it makes really very little difference what a man thinks about the table of the Lord.' Such indifferentism would have been far more deadly than all the divisions between the branches of the Church. A Luther who would have compromised with regard to the Lord's Supper never would have said at the Diet of Worms, 'Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; God help me! Amen.' Indifferentism about doctrine makes no heroes of the faith." (50.) With this Machen at the same time passes a scathing judgment on Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin,

According to Köhler, Zwingli was a humanist; that is, antiquity, which with Luther remained mere form and philological stooge, with Zwingli also became content. This was shown in the fact that he approached the Bible critically with reason, which he regarded as divine revelation. Köhler writes:

"Of the three great Reformers, Luther is the most religious, Calvin the most systematic, Zwingli the most spiritual. He is an original thinker, far more so than Calvin. This stems from the duality of the basis of his intellectual world: humanism and Reformation. Zwingli remained a disciple of Erasmus when he became a disciple of Luther, even breaking with the great humanist prince because he closed the door to the fugitive Ulrich von Hutten, while Zurich, at Zwingli's instigation, granted him an asylum on the Ufenau. With Erasmus the spirit of antiquity remains, and Zwingli binds it together originally with the Reformation faith. The dissection of his thought into these two main factors remains, of course, an artificial one, because the fusion is not an external but an internal-personal one; but without dissection the composition cannot be made clear. Zwingli knew antiquity not only from Erasmus, but on the basis of his own reading. In his library were their authors: Aristotle, Pliny, Aesop, Appian, Aulus, Gellius, Caesar, Catullus, Cicero, Demosthenes, Diodorus, Herodian, Herodotus, Hesiod, Homer, Horace, Josephus, Livius, Lucian, Mela, Pindar, Plato, Plautus, Plutarch, Quintilian, Sallust, Seneca, Strabo, Suetonius, Tacitus, Theocritus, Thucydides, Valerius Maximus, Varro, Virgil, Xenophon, et al. a. The names do not; Luther also knew most of them, and yet his position with respect to antiquity is different. It remained for him a form, a philological stooge for the linguistic training for the understanding of the Gospel. For Zwingli it also became content. Its peculiarity, in keeping with the basic trait of antiquity, acted as rational recognition, which as such crossed the irrationality of Christianity. In Zwingli's world of thought, reason is not the whore or "Frau Hulde mit der Potznasen" that it had to be with Luther; rather, he can appropriate the tendency of ancient philosophy to recognize the world context with reason. And then the Christian principle of cognition, revelation, laid down in the Bible and ever enlivening itself by the Holy Spirit, pushes back. Reason is already in Zwingli's youthful work the Ariadne's thread through the labyrinth of the world. He joyfully quotes Juvenal's "prophet's word": "From heaven came the "Know thyself!"' Closer to this, it is a certain ancient average philosophy, essentially formed by the Stoa, whose thoughts are valued. He finds the balance with the supernatural, biblical knowledge in such a way that that light of reason also came "down from heaven," that is, from God, who thus Himself wills both. Then

Beza and the Reformed all who have ever been willing to enter into union with the Lutherans over communion and other differences. Nor is Machen clear about the unscriptural nature of Zwinglian and Calvinist theology and its pull and push toward rationalism. He did not realize that in the camps of Carlstadt, Ecolampad, and Zwingli against Luther, a rationalism was born into the world of which vulgar and modern rationalism are only consequently developed forms. As a Reformed theologian, Machen carries in his own body the germ of the very modernism which he so zealously and in many respects skillfully combats.

He was not at all afraid of the openly expressed thought that not everything important for religious life then and today was in the Bible. This visibly leads to the Enlightenment, which replaced and made independent all the various sciences that were attached to the Bible and fed from it. Even within the Bible itself, he leaves a great deal of room for the criticism of reason, as certain as he is of the divinity and unanimity of the authority of Scripture. "Faith has its reasons," he can unabashedly link, in fact thereby undermining revelation. For the "reasons' are scientific-rational ones. He also seeks to make clear the process by which the New Testament collection of writings came into being, when he fixes in time the writing of the four Gospels, and sees them singled out from a selection of circulating Gospels. "'The Old Testament has departed, and has never been given otherwise than that it should depart in its time; but the New is eternal, which nevermore may be dismissed'; historical feeling also flashes through in such a word, as certainly, on the other hand, Zwingli artificially retains by allegory the Old Testament words which have become factually useless."

Furthermore, Zwingli philosophically views God as the almighty Lord, not as the one who is responsible for salvation, as Luther does according to Scripture. And since the good (so Zwingli reasoned further) only arose from the moral struggle, God had created man for his own good in such a way that he could fall. Original sin, then, does not mean guilt, but is a mere "hereditary birth", a guiltless, inherited weakness - a fundamental thought of modernism. Köhler continues:

"It is not too difficult to lead through all the various points of the Christian doctrine of faith that duality of Christianity and antiquity, to show the interweaving of rational and irrational moments. This is precisely what makes up Zwingli's religious uniqueness. If one reads his writing "On Divine Providence," which grew out of a sermon before the Hessian landgrave in the castle of Marburg, one believes that one is reading a philosophical treatise, almost a scientific pamphlet on a Darwinian basis. For God is conceived quite abstractly philosophically as the supreme Being, the supreme Good; the heavens tell the glory of God, and nature proclaims the work of his hands; the cosmological, physico-teleological proof of God is given, and some things could just as well have been written in the eighteenth as in the sixteenth century. Man, the crown of creation, stands proudly forth; it is not his sin and misery that announce divine grace, but rather his exalted position in the cosmos of God's majesty. The glory of God as the Almighty, ethically turned: of the holy HErrn, leaps out more sharply and with more emphasis of its own in this universal concept of God than in Luther's purely salvation-historical version. And yet, as soon as Zwingli draws God and man closer together, the Christian problems of sin, of evil, of divine predestination come in. The Stoa gives him a fine solution: 'The good is not comprehended in its essence without evil; comparison and valuation create the understanding of the good.' The good becomes only from moral struggle. To become good, man had to know evil; therefore God let him fall, yea, willed his fall. Then he gave him the law as the classic expression of his will, the value of which he now be-

grip. Thus, a seemingly paradoxical, actually wise and caring measure lies in the violent fall of man: 'for his own good man was created in such a way that he could fall'. Thus a splendid theodicy is gained; but theodicies only ever appear in rational moods, such as those of the apologists of the second century or the enlighteners of the eighteenth. It is far from Luther's mind; to him it is enough: God pleased it so, which Zwingli also knows, but supplemented by rational consideration. Zwingli's solution is not satisfactory if he now lets the individual evil deed be directly willed by God and thus abolishes personal responsibility, not only, to speak with Jacob Boehme, sets the 'extended possibility,' the 'that,' of sin as necessary, but his fundamental thought that in evil and wickedness the end justifies the means, that 'even what seems wicked to us is done for our good,' that 'good always follows from God's activity, even if at the beginning there may be a great crime,' is good and right. And this sharp thinker has also seized the problem of moral responsibility at another decisive point: he resolves the moral responsibility and burden of all mankind through and with Adam's fall, and transforms the hereditary guilt into an 'hereditary brest,' that is, an inherited weakness, since guilt becomes only through the personal act. Is there anything shorter or more plausible than the assertion that original sin is not a guilty sin, but a disease? No one is considered worse or more criminal by a natural defect, which we are accustomed to call in German "ein natürlichen Bresten," for one cannot assume as crime or guilt what is there by nature.* The hereditary Bresten is a blameless misfortune, just as the young wolf inherits savagery as a disposition from his parents, not a sin, but well the source of sin, when the will causes the evil deed to spring from it. Therefore will-less children dying unbaptized are not damned. Zwingli immediately greets the Enlightenment in these thoughts. Only with the breaking of the doctrine of original sin, which drew a complete night over unredeemed humanity, does a history of human development become possible; sin then does not stand at the beginning as the death-bringing damnation, but is a member within a great process. Zwingli does not yet have this process of the cultural history of mankind, but it opens the possibility of his understanding by the elimination of the abrupt either-or: darkness or light, ruin or grace. The whole scheme: in Adam all damned, only in Christ redeemed, is torn open at the decisive point."

"And why so?" asks Köhler. Answer: "Because Zwingli, the good connoisseur of antiquity, makes their condemnation impossible." According to Zwingli, not all religions were equally perfect, but they were real religions, and even pagans could become pleasing to God through their religion. Luther, on the other hand, knew only of "Christianity and unbelief." Zwingli was "the more modern." Köhler writes:

"And why is that? Because Zwingli, a good connoisseur of antiquity, finds it impossible to condemn them. The good and true is not the hereditary lease of Christianity alone; rather, Zwingli gains a general concept to which Christianity and other religions are classified, so that the difference is a gradual one, but not a principle one.

is more zipieller. "Where God's worthy works were done, there was religion long ago,' and God's worthy works can be done even by the Gentiles, for God has put the natural moral law into their hearts. "Seeing that the Gentiles do what the law commands, why do we not know the tree by the fruit?' The formulation of his doctrine of faith, "Of true and false religion,* for Zwingli an unbiased matter of course, is indeed a great intellectual-historical advance, because he works with the general term "religion,* which Zwingli also really knows how to define in terms of the philosophy of religion; the beginnings of modern philosophy of religion and history of religion are stirring, born of the valuing comparison. Luther's doctrine of faith would only know what to say of "Christianity and unbelief*. Zwingli is the more modern, and the modern here means a progress. He has boldly broken through the wall of sole-sanctifying exclusiveness drawn around him by Christianity since the days of the Apostle Paul, and has also drawn up the noble heathen to participate at the table of the kingdom of God. Generally known is the description of the heavenly symposium, which he sketches for the King of France in the "Account of his Faith": next to the righteous of the Old Covenant, next to the pious Christians, sit Socrates, Plato, yes, Hercules and Theseus! These have become seminal thoughts. It is difficult to attribute their effect to Zwingli in particular. On the one hand, they were alluded to by Erasmus and taken up and disseminated by the Dutch students of Erasmus, the so-called "libertines"; on the other hand, there is no closer investigation of the continuing effect of Zwingli's world of thought. It would not have perished without trace even if it had dissolved into the general stream of the Enlightenment. Recent research has pointed to the rise of the insight of "essentials" and "non-essentials" in the Christian doctrine of faith, but has overlooked the fact that the root of this important gradation lies with Erasmus and in Zwingli's circle."

As a modernist, Köhler naturally also approves of the unionist position in Marburg. He approvingly trembles at Zwingli's verdict: "Even if there were some discord between us, that may not bring judgment on the faithful; for Luther and I have faith in Christ our Lord and in him." But, apart from other things, what value is to be attached to such words in the mouth of a man who does not refuse brotherhood even to Socrates, Plato, Hercules, and Theseus? Köhler also declares Zwingli's doctrine of faith, and especially his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, to be purer, brighter, and more spiritual than Luther's. But the fact that Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is not a matter of faith is not a matter of faith. But Köhler does not claim that Zwingli was guided by Scripture in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It is true that he thinks it is wrong to see Zwingli "as a rationalist. But this is precisely what Köhler himself admits when he calls Zwingli's alleged purer, brighter, and more spiritual "antique influence." In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, too, Luther carefully kept away all thoughts of his own, and allowed himself to be guided solely by what the clear word of Scripture says about the matter. Zwingli, however, did not approach the Scriptures in order to hear and learn, but as a rationalist, in order to tell the Scriptures what they say.

The first thing that was said was that the Church had to be taught, and how it had to be interpreted, if it wanted to stand up to the judgment of reason and find grace. In short, Zwinglianism is, in its essence, everywhere Enlightenment emancipation. This last section reads in Köhler, as follows:

"But it would be one-sided to single out the 'Enlightenment' thoughts and overlook the Reformation faith in Zwingli. It is not as massive as Luther's, but it is purer, brighter, because it is more spiritual. This again is done by the ancient impact which set spirit and matter, God and creature, as Zwingli shaped theologically, in the sharpest tension, hard up against the limit of metaphysical dualism. Thence he holds faith at a wonderful elevation: spirit can unite only with spirit; all opacity is rejected. Here lay the deeply religious motive of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which could give no "body," even the transfigured body of Christ, to pure faith as an object. Zwingli never spoke more deeply of religious faith than in the Lord's Supper controversy with Luther, and wholly mistaken is it to see in him here slender rationalism. "To eat Christ's flesh is contrary to the sum of the nature and kind of the Christian spirit. It is the Spirit that makes alive; so it must be Spirit alone that secures our spirit to life.' Zwingli did not succumb to the danger of shallow rationalistic interpretations of the 'Spirit to Spirit'. His faith is strong power. "Faith is a reality; where faith is, there is also the Spirit of God; where that is, there is also a work of good." Zwingli did not object to having Christ present in the Lord's Supper beyond the memorial supper; only it had to be 'in the Spirit.' He did not refrain from this. Therefore the sensual elements were never to him bearers of powers of grace; he only radically breaks apart the natural concept of sacrament; Luther only tore at it. And here Zwingli generally prevailed. He ought to be thanked for it."

"Here Zwingli has generally asserted himself," says Köhler. For "generally" he should have said something like, "also in some Lutheran circles." The first is wrong, but the second is unfortunately true. Especially in the Lutheran churches of Europe, many theologians have long taken Zwingli's schoolmasterly position on Scripture. This is also the reason why liberalism has been able to spread so rapidly and widely in these churches. From Zwingli to the moderns the way is not far. "One should thank Zwingli," concludes Köhler. He would be right if rationalism were really progress towards God and His word, and not rather a return to blind paganism, a return to Socrates and Plato, to Hercules and Theseus. But as long as Gal. 1, 8 is valid, the thanks of the church are not due to Zwingli, the pioneer of modernity, but to Luther - Luther for the faithfulness with which he held on to the absolute supremacy of the Holy Scripture in the face of papists and enthusiasts of all kinds, and thus at the same time, as much as was in him, barred modernism access to the church.

Repeatedly in recent years, astonishment has been expressed that Missouri and its associated synods are

have hitherto kept themselves pure and unsullied by all modernism, and have presented a firm and united front to it. J. C. Monsma, editor of the *Ministers' Monthly*, in a letter dated March 24, 2) says: "It is the glory of the Missouri Synod and allied bodies that in these days of Modernist activity they stand unequivocally for the truth of God. There is perhaps no group of Christians more loyal to Christ than yours. As to the Philippians, Paul would probably have written to you, 'My joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord.'"

It is true that no one in our midst has yet been accused of modernism. It will remain so if we only preserve the spirit that distinguished Luther from Zwingli, the spirit that does not rise above the Scriptures in a schoolmasterly manner, but bows down under the Scriptures and captures reason under the obedience of faith. If we only remain faithful in Lutheranism, modernism will find no power in us. There is nowhere in Lutheranism for it to find a point of contact. It harbours no germs from which it could develop. And if they come flying in from without, they must suffocate in the atmosphere of Scripture. The spirit of Lutheranism frees from all human authority, even that of its own reason, and so makes it immune to all rationalism, even the most modern. The Zwinglian spirit pushes out of Scripture, into the rapturous spaces where, as now in modernism, reason and imagination hold their wild flights and mad dances. The spirit of Lutheranism, on the other hand, drives into Scripture, builds on Scripture, and sticks to the clear word of Scripture. To become a modernist, a Zwinglian need only unfold that,

2) In the previous year the same *Monthly* wrote: "Take, for example, a city like Chicago. We make bold to state that from the eight hundred Protestant pulpits of Chicago and suburbs close to five hundred ministers preach other than Biblical, expository sermons, and this latter figure would mount to almost unbelievable heights *if it were not for one lone denomination*, which in the face of bitter censure and contumelious taunts has been given divine grace to hold its head erect and its right arm, bearing the Word of God, uplifted." As the result of a guestionnair, the same paper, also in the last year, made the announcement: of the Baptist theological seminaries, 4 orthodox, 3 liberal, 1 neutral; of the Presbyterians, 9 orthodox, 4 liberal, 3 neutral; of the Methodists, 0 ortbodox, 9 liberal, 1 neutral; of the Reformed, 4 orthodox, 0 liberal, 2 neutral; of the Congregationalists, 0 orthodox, 7 liberal, 0 neutral; of the Lutherans, all 14 orthodox. On this The Bible Champion of January 1924, p. 17, remarks: "According to the investigations carried on by the editor of the Ministers' Monthly and reported in the September and October numbers of his journal, every Lutheran theological seminary in America is placed in the orthodox column. There is not an exception. Congratulations! This theological steadfastness is not the result of 'ignorance' or 'mossbackism' or 'medievalism'. The professors in these seminaries are live, up-to-date men. They know what is going on in the world and form their own judgment of the movements of the times, but are not given over to running after every new fad in theology, science, and philosophy. Their Church is old and historic enough to know that many a pirouetting sky-rocket flashes in the blue for a few moments and then disappears forever in the engulfing darkness."

what already lies preformed in him. But a Lutheran can only become a liberal theologian after he has completely stripped himself of his Lutheranism, has adopted a manner that is completely foreign to its essence, and has conceded dominion to the "other spirit. The father of neo-rationalism is not Martin Luther, but Ulrich Zwingli, and it is not via Wittenberg, but from Zurich that the road to modernity leads.") F. B.

Literature.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., has published:

1. ***Home Department Questions on Primary Leaflets***. . Eight question sheets. 5 cts. - These questionnaires are intended to serve those children who, for physical reasons, cannot attend Sunday School.

2. *Concordia School Report Card*. . 100 pieces 75 Cts; with the printed name of the school $2.00; 500: $4.50; 1000: $7.50.

3. *My Savior Lives!* A complete program for children's Easter services. By *H. R. Charlé*. 5 cts.; dozen, 50 cts.; 100, $3.50. - The publisher notes: "The text is entirely in verse. The arrangement is such as to enable the parceling out of portions to individual pupils. The melodies are all well known. A sample copy will, upon request, be gladly mailed to every Sunday-school or church officer."

4. A real letter of friendship. A real Brie written to a former teacher and present member of the Elks. 5 Cts. - A heart-moving, convincing letter, which, sent to a Lutheran who has fallen away to a lodge, will hardly miss its effect.

5. Cantate! A song service in commemoration of the quadricentennial of the first Lutheran hymnal. 1524-1924. Arranged by P. E. K. 20 cts. - Our publisher writes: "The service contains items for the pastor, for solo voices, quartets, children's choruses, choirs, and the congregation. Where- ever the music is not readily found in the Choralbuch or the musical setting of hymnals used by our churches, this music edition of Cantate! furnishes the full score." This cantata can also be used for other occasions. The English-German text is to be had separately-12: 30 Cts.; 100: $2.25.

3) In the great march of conquest and victory which liberalism in America, especially since the World War, has held through almost all sects, the assertion emerges again and again, especially among fundamentalists, that, like all misery in the world, modern unbelief also has its real source in Germany. And the guilt of the German critics does not want to be diminished or even denied. But it must not be overlooked that England and America are in the same damnation. In particular, it should be noted that in America, long before the wider acquaintance with German unbelief in almost all sectarian churches, especially among the Congregationalists, Disciples and Baptists, the general indifference to doctrine and hostility to any firm confession had opened the gates to all false teachers and given them free play; that, further, the Unitarians, Universalists, and Lodges, all of which had great success in America more than a hundred years ago, did not import their unbelief from Germany; that, finally, the ultimate roots even of German Liberalism are to be sought not in Luther, but in Zwingli, Calvin, and the Reformed. In America, too, the sons of Zwingli and Calvin do not need to import unbelief; it is in their blood.

Sanctification; in the apostolic church included the communication of miraculous gifts; even today often confers a special measure of knowledge, witnessing courage, etc. This work was presented to the Western District in 1922, which then also professed the same.

7. Die rechte Weltanschauung. Lecture delivered at the 1923 Synod of Delegates by F. Pieper. [F. P.] 10 Cts. - This lecture, already communicated in "Lehre und Wehre," by D. Pieper's lecture, already mentioned in "Lehre und Wehre," has now also appeared, adorned with the portrait of the versifier, in the ***Paimen*** we have often mentioned, in a Finnish translation. It deserves the widest dissemination also in lay circles.

F. B.

Synocal Manual of the Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 184 pp. 90 Cts.

This edition, revised and completed by D. Fürbringer, contains "the constitution and by-laws of our synod, the regulations for all standing commissions and officials of the synod, an imprint of all important documents of the synod, and an appendix of declarations and regulations of the synod on a number of questions and matters. Finally, there are printed the agreements of our Synod with other church bodies concerning transfers from one Synod to another and similar questions, and finally the Constitution of the Synodal Conference, its by-laws and decrees. A detailed table of contents forms the appendix." All members of the Synod should now thoroughly acquaint themselves with this "Handbook." A separate edition of the Constitution and By-Laws in paper cover costs 20 Cts, a print of the Constitution and By-Laws of the Synodical Conference in paper cover 15 Cts.

F. B.

Slave or master? The path to personal and national rebirth. By D. Dr. E. Dennert. Published by the Westphalian People's Service in Mitten.

The biologist D. Dennert has made a name for himself in Germany through his apologetic writings. In them he fights Darwinism and advocates theism; but he does not do justice to the Bible and Christianity. This is also true of the above book, which seeks to show the unhappy Germans the way to personal and national rebirth. What is said here against theoretical and practical materialism is excellent. But as soon as Dennert enters the actual theological field, he goes astray. He does not follow the Scriptures, but his own thoughts. For him, personal rebirth consists in man's no longer being guided in his actions by selfishness, but by love. And the way to this goal is more mystical and theosophical than Christian. Of course, Dennert also speaks of reconciliation. But he decisively rejects the vicarious suffering of Christ. He writes: "Sin can be forgiven, but its consequences must be borne by each one himself; they cannot be remitted according to the law of retribution. They are the punishment which is inexorable and as lawful (st as the reward as a result of the good deed." This is the doctrine of India on Karma. Even the prayer for the removal of suffering is, according to Dennert, reprehensible per se. But what is the use of a Saviour of sinners if we have to pay the penalty of our sins ourselves? "The punishment was upon Him," that is Christian faith, Christian consolation. Then, as regards the national revival, it is a utopian delusion if Dennert thinks that the whole German people, or even a majority of them, will ever overcome their innate selfishness, let themselves be guided in their doings and actions entirely by the law of love, and thus form a kind of love-state. In accordance with its nature, everywhere in the world the State has always been a power State, whose real weapon is the sword, violence. And as long as the world stands, it will remain so. There has probably never been a nation in which the true children of God (who, on top of everything, will not get rid of the old Adam here from earth either) formed the majority. In the so-called Christian countries the openly un-Christians are in the majority. And among those who call themselves Christians, again not the Tatchrists, but the Word Christians form the majority. To found and carry on a state, even Christianity is not absolutely necessary. Even a moderate measure is sufficient for this

of reason, love of country, and civil respectability, things which may be found even among those who are not Christians. Even among the heathen there have been states which are not inferior to some so-called Christian states. The truth that Christians are the best citizens and the strongest pillars of the state is not affected by this. For, although Christianity does not consist and merge in patriotism and civic honesty, it nevertheless favors and promotes these and other civic virtues, without which, however, the State cannot exist in the long run. F. B.

The Moloch Hamburg. A contemporary portrait of manners by J. C. Ommerborn. Volkswachtverlag Hamburg. Alexanderstraße 21/23.

The moral conditions in Hamburg are described here in the form of a story. It is published in the interest of the "German Midnight Mission", which also asks for donations of money and clothing for its work on the most submerged. F. B.

Physical Training of Public Speakers. By Martin S. Bommer. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 65 cts,

We Lutherans have a glorious message: the louder gospel found nowhere else in Christendom. This message must now be brought to the people. The" main means for this is and remains the oral word: the clear, understandable, serious, impressive speech. Apart from anything else, therefore, preachers and all who want to become preachers must be careful that their public speaking does not lack these qualities. In speaking, too, we must be satisfied only with the very best. We owe this not only to ourselves, but to our hearers and to the glorious cause in whose service God has placed us. Here, if anywhere, the saying of the golden apples in silver bowls applies. In any case, the lecture must not be blamed for the fact that the listeners do not come into right, full contact with the blessed content of the sermon. But whoever wants to give a good lecture must do the appropriate exercises. And it is the purpose of the present booklet of our valuable colleague to be helpful for this. Whoever follows the instructions given here and practices will benefit greatly in more ways than one. F. B.

Biblical Texts for Special Occasions. By Paul W. Nesper. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, 0. $2.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Following the "Textbook for Preachers" by Chr. Rom er, this booklet offers numerous printed texts for the church year, occasional sermons, misfion sermons, etc. It should often save the pastor a lot of searching. It should often save the pastor a long search. The various series of texts are provided with short introductions. Of these, one begins as follows: "The task of preaching at the funerals of impenitent and immoral men is a delicate and difficult one. It becomes doubly difficult in the case of a suicide, but no minister should shrink from the task." Of course, we cannot approve of the advice hereby given. How can the church, without denial, honor a manifest sinner and despiser of Christianity with a Christian funeral, which is precisely every funeral in which the pastor, as pastor, officially participates? - We have not read the following book, which we received from the same publisher: Sermon Sketches on Old Testament Eisenach Texts. By C. A. Freseman, G. F. Hein, W. E. Schuette, and others. $2.00, net. F. B.

Church History. For the People. By Rev. G. H. Trabert, D. D. Third edition. Illustrated, Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, 0. 462 pp. $3.00. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book is a revised edition of the popular church history published by Pilgerbuchhandlung already in 1897. That the revision has not brought everything up to date, however, is testified among other things by the footnote p. 284 where it says of Finland: "though now under Russian rule", historically not true.

is the remark p. 270: "In the Leipzig Interim (1548), adopted as the law of religious worship and usages for the countries of Saxony, he [Melanchthon], however, denied most decidedly all merit to man in conversion." There is also something to be noted concerning Spener and Pietism: "As a pendulum swings from one extreme to the other, so here the opposite extreme was reached in due time, and nationalism took the place of Pietism at Halle." The direction of Pietism and Rationalism is, according to its inner nature, not a diverging, but a converging one. Of Schleiermacher, who, after all, if we look closely, only put on a mystical garment for rationalism (much as pantheism did for materialism), it is extolled: "The first and noblest of these champions [through whom the religious life was again elevated] was Friedrich Ernst Daniel Schleiermacher. . . . While himself not free from a strong rationalistic taint, he again exalted Jesus of Nazareth as the center of our religion and set forth man's absolute dependence upon God." (345.) The section on the Lutheran Synods of America gives no insight into the various doctrinal positions of the same, but confines itself to the external. Referring to the Merger of 1918 and the General Synod, it says: "The laxity which had characterized a portion of the Church half a century earlier had disappeared in the main." (419.) Is this in accordance with the facts? Of the National Lutheran Council it is said, "It serves as a clearing-house for the Lutheran Church, excepting the Synodical Conference." (422.) Even the Iowa Synod has not belonged to this connection for several years. F. B.

Christianity and Liberalism. By J. Gresham Machen, D. D., Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. The Macmillan Co, New York, N. Y. 189 pages. Price: $1.00. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The present desperate struggle with modernism is reminiscent of the Laoko group, in which the giant snake holds the father and his two sons in its embrace and is about to squeeze out the breath of life from him. How will the fight end? The fundamentalists have no shortage of courageous and, in some respects, skillful champions, although most would prefer less rhetoric, more logic, fewer words, more action. In recent years a spate of articles and books has appeared, all striving in their way to save from ruin the basic Christian truths: the personality of God, Christ's deity, the atonement by His blood, the miraculous work of conversion, etc. Journals to be mentioned here include: *The Princeton Theological Review, The Bible Champion, The Moody Monthly, The Presbyterian, The Ministers' Monthly,* etc.

It was Princeton theologians in particular who were ever and always in the forefront of the positives: Men like Warfield, Green, Paton, and others more, to whom now D. Machen excludes. Some months ago the *Princeton Review expressed* its appreciation of the anti-liberal position of the Missouri Synod. We, too, rejoice that there are still men in Reformed circles who offer defiance to the Modernists. They are nearer to us than some supposed luminaries in the national churches of Europe, nearer, for instance, than Söderblom, celebrated even by the Augustan Synod. As a rule, however, even they do not want the matter to be carried to the breaking point, to outward separation. The sheep and lambs are to remain in one fold with the wolves and wildcats (as David Henkel once expressed it) until the latter depart voluntarily. What will be the result is taught by the European models.

D. According to Machen, however, further cohabitation is impossible. To him, liberalism is not a mere heresy, not merely a corrupted Christianity, but a totally different religion, a religion that is no more Christianity than the gorilla is a man. Machen writes: "Modern liberalism not only is a different religion from Christianity, but belongs in a totally different class of religions." (7.) "If a condition could be conceived in which all the preaching of the Church should be controlled by the liberalism which in many quarters has already become preponderant, then, we believe, Chris-

tianity would at last have perished from the earth and the Gospel would have sounded forth for the.last time." (8.) ^ierau§ jiept Wa^en audp bte fjolge: "In the intellectual battle of the present day there can be no 'peace without victory'; one side or the other must win." (6.)

Machen rightly describes naturalism as the last root of liberalism, which only allows inner-worldly causes to resound, but flatly denies supernatural interventions of any kind. He writes: "The many varieties of modem liberal religion are rooted in naturalism, that is, in the denial of any entrance of the creative power of God (as distinguished from the ordinary course of nature) in connection with the origin of Christianity." (2.)

The Modernists, as we know, advocate a dogma-free religion, which they then also call undogmatic Christianity. As if there were or could be such a thing! In the world, some say: Through our honorable life we shall be happy and blessed. Others confess: One does not become righteous and blessed by "pious living," but by grace, for Christ's sake. Every man in the world is devoted to one of these two faiths. Dogmatically they are both, only that one is Christian, the other just pagan. Liberal Russell Briggs boasts in the *Atlantic Monthly of* ninety-year-old Eliot: "To-day he is the greatest figure in the history of American education, the foremost citizen of the United States-not honored only, but beloved." We, too, appreciate men like Plato, Cicero, Goethe, Eliot, and other intellectual giants: Christians they are not, however. Eliot, too, has repeatedly confessed his unbelief. In the *Atlantic Monthly of* March of last year (p. 385) he again boasts of the future Christianity which, as Eliot remarks, the modernists sought to raise (admittedly with little honesty or candor) from "old phrases with new interpretations": "It will regard the Christian religion not as a body of doctrines, new or old, but as a way of life." The word "way of life" here is an untrue phrase. Eliot knows as well as we do that there is not, nor can be, a particular way of life without a particular faith. Basically, even his effort is not to make Christianity truly dogma-free, but to substitute his own dogmas and thoughts for Christian teachings.

But with what right the thing called dogma-less religion is called Christianity, undogmatic, Machen also spreads about it. In his remarks it is said, among other things: "'Just as I am, without one plea, But that Thy blood was shed for me'-that which Paul was contending for in Galatia; that hymn would never have been written if the Judaizers had won." (25.) The assertion that Paul was the first to turn Christianity into a doctrine and to distort it is taken purely out of the air. For the very things taught by Paul are taught by Jesus Himself. Machen writes: "But if any one fact is clear, on the basis of this evidence, it is that the Christian movement at its inception was not just a way of life in the modern sense, but a way of life founded upon a message. It was based, not upon mere feeling, not upon a mere program of work, but upon an account [and a definite interpretation] of facts. In other words, it was based upon doctrine." (21.) "From the beginning," Machen concludes this line of thought, "the Christian Gospel, as indeed the name 'gospel' or 'good news' implies, consisted in an account of something that had happened. And from the beginning the meaning of the happening was set forth; and when the meaning of the happening was set forth, then there was Christian doctrine. 'Christ died' - that is history; 'Christ died for our sins' - that is doctrine. Without these two elements, joined in an absolutely indissoluble union, there is no Christianity." (27.)

Of course, Machen's reformed nature and orientation are also evident, as for example in his judgment on Marburg in 1529, to which reference has already been made elsewhere in this issue. We also include Machen's opinion that one can reach Christian certainty through intellectual struggle. Referring to people who place no special weight on rational arguments for the truth of Christianity, Machen writes: "'What,' they say, 'is the need of argument in defense of the Bible? Is it not the Word of God, and does it not carry with it an immediate cer-.

titude of its truth, which could only be obscured by defense? If science comes into contradiction with the Bible, so much the worse for science!' For these persons we have the highest respect, for we believe that they are right in the main point; they have arrived by a direct and easy road at a conviction which for other men is attained only through intellectual struggle." (9.) But only one road, the road which all Christians take, the intellectual as well as the simple, leads here to divine certainty. This way is called, "Law and Gospel: repentance and faith." Certainly, an apologetic spiritual warfare with weapons of sound reason and science against the arguments of radicals and atheists is able to clear away some external obstacles which sometimes obstruct the way of words. But such an intellectual struggle does not lead to divine certainty with reference to the beatific truth, and thus to certainty also with reference to the infallibility and absolute reliability of Scripture. Machen is mistaken if he thinks that he has arrived at spiritual certainty by scientific means. Of course, this does not mean that every apologetic struggle with unbelief, which often makes a mockery of all reason, is condemned outright. Only one must conduct it properly and not, as some fundamentalists do, expect the impossible, for instance even positive proofs of reason before a jury of rationalists for the Incarnation, the virgin birth, the divinity of Christ, etc. Articles of faith never become articles of reason, but always remain articles of faith in spite of all science and apologetics. It is faith alone that places Christians in the higher spiritual sphere, where they are divinely certain of Christian truth and Scripture without any proofs of reason - precisely through the word of Scripture and faith.

In his investigation Machen sometimes also interspersed more offside thoughts. Thus we read, for example, with reference to the boast, especially before the war, that "the world is getting better and better": "The modern world represents in some respects an enormous improvement over the world in which our ancestors lived; but in other respects it exhibits a lamentable decline. The improvement appears in the physical conditions of life, but in the spiritual realm there is a corresponding loss. . . No great poet is now living to celebrate the change; humanity has suddenly become dumb. Gone, too, are the great painters and the great musicians and the great sculptors. . . . Even the appreciation of the glories of the past is gradually being lost, under the influence of a utilitarian education that concerns itself only with the production of physical well-being. The Outline of History of Mr. H. G. Wells, with its contemptuous neglect of all the higher ranges of human life, is a thoroughly modern book." (10.) "Material betterment has come hand in hand with spiritual decline." (15.) We have paid dearly enough before, during, and after the World War for the ordinary doctrine that machines, airships, wireless telephony, etc., are incapable of raising either morals or religion; but, unfortunately, in many cases it has still not been really understood and learned. The Augsburg Confession instructed Charles V to take to heart "that now and in [the] last times and days, of which Scripture tells us, the world grows ever worse and men grow ever more frail and weak". This is still true today.

Finally, there is room here for a judgment on school legislation in Michigan, Oregon, New York, and other states, and on the ever-expanding restrictions on our liberty. "A people," writes Machen, "which tolerates such preposterous legislation upon the statute books is a people that has wandered far away from the principles of American liberty." (14.) To preserve this liberty has now cost us, too, much care, toil, labor, and money in our school struggles. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," even in free America. "God grant," writes Machen, "that there may come a reaction, and that the great principles of Anglo-Saxon liberty may be rediscovered before it is too late!" But here some may ask: Where did the British ever stand up for liberty, except for their own, or only where it served their own interest? And was it not Puritans, etc., who have ever been bent on capturing the liberty of their fellow-citizens in their own arbitrary power? F. B.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From the Synod. The "Lutheran" of April 15 calls attention to an error found in Dr. Carroll's statistics of ecclesiastical communions, which has been printed in many periodicals in the country. Dr. Carroll has attributed to the Missouri Synod a loss of 5004 communicant members in the last year. According to our own statistics, which, though also not yet perfect, are very accurately worked, the Synod has not lost 5004 communicating members, but has gained 7886. The total number of communicant members is 646,837. Voting members the Synod counts 165,069, an increase of 1055. Our school system, which was greatly damaged during and as a result of the war, is rising again. It says in the report of our statistician: "Here and there some schools have disappeared, but instead new schools have been established in other places. We now have 31 more schools than last year, namely 1376. 78,610 children (+ 2293) attend these schools. There are 1116 teachers (+ 28), 380 female teachers (+ 37) and 480 school-keeping pastors (+ 20). In addition, 18,909 children are still being taught, as best they can, in 871 Saturday and summer schools by 722 pastors. The Sunday schools have increased by 135, and the number of Sunday school children by 9921. In 2048 Sunday schools 137, 157 children are taught by 12,662 teachers." - The report on the synodical school system reminds us of a note we recently read in a single report on the school system of the Western District. This note proves that by the grace of God it is possible in the midst of a large city, where the public schools are above the average level, to slowly build up a parochial school from very small beginnings. We refer to St. Louis Immanuel Parish. For this congregation (the second oldest in St. Louis, the oldest being Trinity) some of the older pastors will have a lively interest. Hundreds of students have found a very pleasant temporary home within this congregation during their college years in St. Louis. But the territory of this congregation was gradually taken by name by the Negro population. The members of the congregation moved to the western, northern, and southern parts of the city, and joined the sister congregations existing there. Finally, only a small number of parishioners remained for the large, beautiful church at the corner of Fifteenth and Morgan Streets, which had seating for 1500 to 1800 persons. The congregation had to think of finding a new place. It chose a place in the northern part of the city, on Marcus Avenue. It built a small temporary church there, seating about 250, and also immediately established a parochial school. The first year the pastor himself held school with 6 children. The second year the congregation called a substitute from our Normal School in River Forest. The number of pupils doubled. The third year the congregation unsuccessfully called a school board candidate, because by far larger schools badly wanted teachers; but they were able to keep the substitute for another year. Last year it obtained its own teacher, and the school now numbers about 30 children. In addition to the parish school, the parish has

a Sunday school of about 100 children. The congregation is bilingual. - All readers of the church bulletins of our Brazilian District know that our brethren there are engaged in blessed work, but at the same time also in a continual difficult struggle against Rome, the Uniates and the sects. And that they, by God's grace, are fighting the battle in the right spirit, we also see from an article "Something about Polemics", which is found in the "Ev.Luth. Kirchenblatt für Südamerika" (Porto Alegre, February 15, 1924). From it we share the following: "Is polemic justified? Is the church built by polemics? The vast majority of those who call themselves Christians, and also many among those who are really Christians, answer these questions in the negative. They say something like: The perpetual polemic is not compatible with love, with peace; it does not flow from a gentle spirit. Christ is the Prince of Peace, His Church here on earth is to be a kingdom of peace; but by such fighting about doctrine the peace is always disturbed and disunity sown.' Our Evangelical Lutheran Church, because it fights earnestly for pure doctrine against all false doctrine, is looked upon as the great disturber, and is held up as the chief hindrance to right unity in the Protestant Church. Even our own flesh often whispers to us, 'Our church would have much more attendance, our congregations would edify much more quickly, we would be much more respected in the world, if we were not so exact, so narrow-hearted in weighing every doctrine.'" But the polemic is not in our caprice. Christ and his holy apostles polemicized, and every pastor is not only to present the pure doctrine of God's word, but also to be mighty to chastise the gainsayers, Tit. 1:9. "Let us therefore, confidently and in God's name, in school and church, privately and publicly, in preaching and writing, earnestly and zealously contend for pure doctrine and against all false doctrine. In the words of Luther, "we do not only want to feed the sheep, so that we instruct them how to be true Christians, but we also want to ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false doctrine and introduce error". After the example of our fathers, let us not only scatter the seed of the pure word, but also weed out all the weeds of false doctrine to the best of our ability." In the second part of the article, the right way of polemics is pointed out. "Polemics are to be conducted with due caution. A pastor or an editor has not the profession or the duty of weeding out every conceivable heresy and false doctrine before his congregation or before his readers. A careless and unnecessary acquaintance with all sorts of heresies, which may be long dead and buried, often has a very different effect from that intended, namely, that something of the previously unknown heresies will stick. An old maxim of experience says: "To speak of unknown heresies before the inexperienced people is to talk them in.' One should mention and refute only those heresies that are in vogue, or from which listeners or readers are threatened with danger. It is also part of the right caution in polemicizing that the false doctrine which one opposes should be stated as briefly and accurately as possible, if possible in the false teachers' own words: briefly, because the actual point of controversy is often obscured or covered up by a verbose discussion; accurately, lest the appearance of inaccuracy or superficiality be awakened; in the false teachers' own words, lest even malicious opponents should not be able to understand the account given.

can turn and twist. Furthermore, the right distinction between person and cause is a part of the necessary caution in polemics. It is necessary to combine all hatred of false doctrine with heartfelt compassion and pity for the poor deceived and deceived. For the sake of the truly faithful children of God, who are still to be found even in false churches, for the sake of the deceived souls who are in terrible danger of being eternally lost, and for the sake of the weak in our own midst, everything personal, hateful, and insulting must be avoided, because by it the weak and erring are easily annoyed and repelled rather than attracted by the right doctrine. Thus, for example, Luther, in his eight sermons at Wittenberg, did not even mention Carlstadt's name; much less did he use mocking, contemptuous expressions against the adversaries." "Now if the ultimate purpose of polemics is God's glory and the blessedness of our neighbor, it follows that right, fruitful polemics are to be conducted with one weapon only, the word of God. "As earnestly as the Lutheran Church fights the false believers, such fighting is done, not with carnal weapons, but with the sword of the Spirit alone, with the Word of God.'" The Roman Church, some Reformed Churches, and the Uniate Church have at various times wielded carnal weapons against dissenters. They have stained themselves with the blood of their fellows. Have they thereby saved souls from eternal destruction? Did they thereby follow the path prescribed by God? God's Word says: '"The weapons of our knighthood are not carnal, but mighty in the sight of God, to disturb the strongholds, that we might disturb the assaults, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bring every reason into captivity unto the obedience of Christ,' 2 Cor. 10:4, 5." "Finally, let every one beware of arrogance and conceit in polemics. That we have pure doctrine is a great, unmerited grace of our God. Let us beware with all seriousness of the dangerous delusion of Israel: 'Here is the temple of the Lord!' or: 'We have Abraham for a father!' by exclaiming in the same spirit: 'We are Lutherans, we have the pure doctrine!' A polemic flowing from such an attitude can never be a polemic pleasing to God; the right polemic must rather flow from the earnest, heartfelt plea: 'Hallowed be thy name!' " - So far the "Kirchenblatt." In regard to the last point, we add a word of Luther's which has always been important to the undersigned. Luther remarks (IX, 1239) on the words 1 Pet. 3, 16: "and that with meekness and fear" as follows: "That is, when you are asked about your faith, you should not answer with proud words and want to carry the matter out with defiance and violence, as if you wanted to uproot trees, but with such fear and humility as if you were standing before God's judgment and should answer. For if it should happen that you were summoned to appear before kings and princes, and had prepared yourself for a time with proverbs, and thought thus: Wait, I will answer them aright; and it shall come to pass, that the devil shall take the sword out of thy hands before thou knowest it, and give thee a thrust, that thou mayest stand with shame, and have armed thyself in vain, that thou mayest pluck out of thy heart the proverbs which thou hadst well composed, that thou mightest be lacking, if thou hadst it well in mind: for he hath perceived thy thoughts aforetime. God therefore causeth it to come to pass, that he may restrain thy pride.

And humble thyself. Therefore, if thou wouldest that such things should not befall thee, thou must stand in fear, and not rely upon thine own skill and wisdom. . . . It is right for thee to answer that thou mayest be well armed with the sayings of the scriptures: but take heed that thou be not proud of them, lest God pluck out of thy mouth and out of thy memory the right and strong saying, when thou hast been armed with all the sayings before. Therefore fear is part of it. But if thou art thus skillful, thou canst answer to princes and lords, and even to the devil himself. Only see to it that it is not man's doing, but God's word." - In the same "Kirchenblatt" the following example is given of the papist mischief in South America: "The Catholic Navegantes festival. Who does not know this abominable idolatry of the Catholic population with the 'Nossa Senhora dos Navegantes'? As is well known, the image of the Mother of God is transported from the Rosary Church to the Navegantes Church on February 2nd, and this is done with an effort that rarely has its equal. The "Nossa Senhora", who is said to have miraculously saved several sailors years ago and to have performed many other great miracles, is worshipped, venerated, even idolized on this day. On a richly decorated sailing ship the image of the Mother of God is carried to the suburb of Navegantes; all the steamers, sailing ships and boats of the port that can get away follow; all the whistles sound; rockets rattle, and an immense crowd surges up and down despite the great heat. Two priests devoutly follow the idol. Once inside the church, the poor people kneel under the image and all around it, bring lots of candles as gifts, buy an image of the Mother on top of it, and finally leave the church under the delusion that they have done a meritorious work and thus covered a lot of sins. Then outside, in many stalls, they eat and drink, if not booze, 'and each one rejoices in his life. O poor, beguiled, and deluded people!" F. P.

Concerning the Negro preachers of the sects, we read in the last report of the Synodical Conference (p. 27): "The well-known Negro leader, Booker T. Washington (died 1915), says: "Three-fourths of the Baptist and two-thirds of the Methodist Negro preachers are neither spiritually nor morally capable of preaching the gospel to others or of being leaders to others. With few exceptions, the preaching of colored ministers is emotional in the highest degree, and the minister considers himself successful to the extent that he succeeds in exciting the people throughout the congregation to groan, shout wildly, and dance about until they finally fall into unconscious rapture (finally going into a trance). One of the chief duties of most of these preachers is to exorcise their content, and to this end everything else is subordinated. The greater part of the service seems to consist in attempts to beat money out of the colored people. Not one among twenty negro preachers has credit in his neighborhood, and he who knows them best trusts them least, either in money matters or in moral matters generally. . . . Many church members know as little of true Christianity as any people in Africa or Japan, and are as much in need of missionary work among them as heathen are in distant lands.' Thus far Booker Washington. What he says our missionaries in the South can confirm a hundredfold."

Our flourishing negro mission, then, is heathen mission in the true sense of the word.
F. B.

The Golden Tablets of the Mormons. In his paper "Zur Beurteilung des Propheten der Mormonen Joseph Smith" the Dutchman Dr. van der Volk proves that Joseph Smith is a "Pseudophilolog", a "Pseudohebraicus" and a "Pseudoägyptolog". In the "Theol. Literaturztg." (Sp. 402) it says: "Van der Valk goes into most detail about the 'golden and brass tablets' on which the *Book of Mormon is* based, which are supposed to have been given to Smith by the angel Moroni and may in fact have been Egyptian plates (so-called hypocephalies, pieces from a mummy's coffin), which Smith had been able to buy. It is hair-raising what kind of 'expertise' Smith shows. That he is a simple forger and swindler is beyond doubt. . . . Smith boasts, among other things, of the most peculiar linguistic skills, such as Hebrew words, which one can see have been spoon-fed to him by modern English-speaking Jews. Amusing is the information Smith himself gives how the word 'Mormon' is to be understood; he had formed it himself from 'mon', which is Egyptian and means 'good' (van der Valk states that this is nonsense), and English 'mors'. In the contraction he, Smith, had meant to leave the 'e' aside, so 'mormon' - better, scil. (this is how I interpret Smith's not exactly factually clear explanation) the book of the angel Moroni is the 'better Bible'. Smith, after all, sticks to the Bible in his way, only with such additions, interpretations, paraphrases, etc., as give as new revelations the 'true' text of the Bible and reveal its history to the peoples of America (the Indians). Van der Valk sees in Smith only the 'deceiver'. Admittedly, not entirely or summarily in the moral sense. For Smith, he says, was a degenerate through and through, psychologically pathological, born of such a family. The basic formula for his being was 'pseudologia phantastica'. What visions and inspirations he is said to have had is uncontrollable. "
F. B.

II. Abroad.

The Lutheran Church and the Protestant Sects in Russia. On this subject we read in the "A. E. L. K.": "The sectarian propaganda has in recent years assumed an extent of which one can hardly form an idea. The chaotic condition in which the Russian Church finds itself at the present time greatly favors the activity of the various sects. Sectarian communities are springing up everywhere, even in the smallest and most remote places. Their emissaries roam the country and recruit with great success. The religious movements among the Russians, which have existed for decades under the name of Stundism, and in which great hopes were placed, have fallen entirely into sectarian waters. The most notable leaders of the so-called Russian evangelical Christians published a great rally this spring and also wrote a kind of confession. They now expressly reject infant baptism and the church office as such. Sectarian propaganda is also penetrating more and more into Lutheran congregations, and in many cases has been accompanied by success. Baptists, Adventists, Irvingians, and various others are running roughshod over each other. Even the Methodists, who in Russia formerly had scarcely any

have been known, are developing a lively activity. In the choice of means the agitators are nowadays even less selective than usual. Thus they spread everywhere the rumor that the Lutheran Church in Russia and other countries has dissolved itself and that the sects have taken over its inheritance. Wherever our parishioners lack denominational consciousness and the ability to judge, as is unfortunately all too often the case, the swarming spirits make rich prey. When their emissaries have reached their goal in one place and gained as large a number of followers as possible, they move on without caring much for the 'new converts'. The damage already done to our Lutheran Church in its numerical stock cannot even be approximated. If we do not soon take energetic measures, we shall have to give up many congregation members to the others, indeed whole congregations will be lost to our church. The latter seems already to be the case in Siberia, as one hears." One is thinking in Russia, as we see from the same church newspaper, of setting up a "fast course" for the training of preachers. It says there, "Since at present it is not possible to call pastors from abroad to Russia, and since, on the other hand, the sending of younger people from Russia to foreign countries for theological study would encounter difficulties of various kinds and would also take many years, thought must be given to the training of emergency preachers, itinerant teachers, and evangelists in Russia itself. If the congregations are not to fall prey to sectarian propaganda, then from the number of sextons and other church-minded men who have proved themselves in the ministry, such must be selected and trained in a fast-track course as can be entrusted with the office of emergency preachers. For this purpose a foundation is to be established in Russia under the direction of academic teachers. No difficulties are expected on the part of the Soviet Government. Various religious communities already possess training schools for preachers." The difficulty is likely to be that of finding such "academic teachers" who are themselves firmly grounded in Lutheran doctrine, that is, who are not infected by the modern Lutheran spirit which rejects the inspiration of Scripture and the satisfactio vicaria. F. P.

Film theatres, the pros and cons. In the "Mitteilungsblatt des Jugendbundes", in a supplement to No. 3 of the "Ev.-Luth. Freikirche", we find a calm and objective presentation of what can be said for and against the movie theaters, called "cinemas" in Germany. After pointing out the great demand for this newest means of popular education and entertainment ("In large cities, the daily attendance at the cinemas often amounts to 100,000 persons and more"), it goes on to say: "What is offered to our youth in the cinema? Everything and anything can be depicted and reproduced. What possibilities therefore lie in this wonderful invention! Here we are shown regions that leave nothing to be desired in terms of romantic appeal; there we are led into parts of the world that we would never think of entering. We get to know the customs and traditions of the most diverse peoples and races. Today we go into all conceivable factories, into the mines, tomorrow out on the glassy sea, up to the highest glacier mountains, then again into the desert and the almost impenetrable primeval forest, where the wild animals still live. The great wonders in the plant world and even the devastations that

...that microbes do in the human body are clearly demonstrated. So that would be the light side of cinema. It could do all that and have that purpose. But does it? Not by a long shot. After a careful investigation in specialist journals, it was found that out of about 100 film synopses listed, only about four percent dealt with what we mentioned earlier. What about the other 96 percent, you ask? Love and marriage scandals, elaborate crimes and morally questionable things form the main theme. Today there are depictions of burglaries, poison-mongering, arson, and tomorrow mad scenes and all sorts of senseless stuff. And what a magical effect these scenes have on the young! Yes, it is just the eternally new, the exciting, the adventurous in the thing that appeals to the youthful thirst for knowledge. What a corrupting influence on body and soul a continual visit to such a place may have! What a spirit is inculcated in youth here! Many a one has later only carried out what he has learned here. Thus the cinema is mostly in the service of fornication and sin. You can tell that just by looking at the big pictures and posters that are everywhere in the streets." - What is said in the foregoing also fits our country and well pretty much all countries. That is in the nature of things. Like the theatre in general, the film theatre species should also pay for itself. If this end is to be achieved, then one has to keep to the large audience. But the large audience is primarily interested in the 96 percent described above. Here, in the United States, there are perhaps more religious objects mixed in with the above four percent than in other countries. One also wants to win over the religiously-minded audience for the movies, so that they serve as a cover of shame for the whole. Before the war and during the war, the movie theaters were concededly in the service of war propaganda in our country as well. In St. Louis, too, the "Belgian atrocities," which according to the official reports of our consuls and our Surgeon General, Dr. Gorgas', were all fictitious, were shown to the large public through the motion picture. Thus a large part of the people was whipped into a horrible mood. The movie theaters are to blame in no small part for the misery that pretty much prevails throughout the world at the present time, including our own country. Both of our recently deceased presidents, as reported in the newspapers, have spoken out against the so-called "Hun stories." Since we ourselves have been asked by peace societies in the last year to give our advice on how the world, which has gone out of joint, can be set right again ("Have you a plan for peace?"), we take the liberty of giving an advice which lies outside all politics and only in the field of natural morality. The "League of Nations" and the other associations which strive to cure the psychosis of war and to prevent future wars as far as possible, need for the present only adopt one sentence: "Thou shalt not lie." Then, as a consecration, it should be added, "We hereby retract all lies uttered before and during the war." This would certainly help to improve the mood of the world. One of our statesmen, in a public speech about two years ago, recommended the adoption of the sentence to all nations, and especially to all leaders of them,

that nations should deal with each other as decent people deal with each other personally. Perhaps, in order to make propaganda for this truth, the movie theaters could be used - for a fee, of course. But the money would not be ill-applied and would actually prove a saving. Dr. Eliot, ex-president of Harvard, according to newspaper reports, published a few sentences ago for the purpose of healing the world's ills and our country's ills. Our religious newspapers are striving year in and year out in the same direction. They, too, should consider our advice, because, as I have said, it is so entirely out of the political field. It is our firm conviction that great harm would thereby be averted both from other countries and from our own so richly blessed country. Perhaps it will be objected to our advice that it is impractical, because God himself says in his word that all men are liars. This is true. But God does not say this to encourage us to continue confidently in our lying, but to urge us to repent of our lies, so that we may flee in faith to the Savior of sinners, who, as he has paid for all sins, has also paid for our sins of lying with his blood. No one needs to exalt himself above another. Pretty much the whole world has lied, and we with it. F. P.

Intervention against socialist mischief in Berlin schools. The "A. E. L. K." reports: "At the session of the Prussian House of Representatives on January 24, it was stated by the national side that outrageous events were taking place in Berlin municipal schools, and that nude dances were even being performed. This was denied by the Social Democrats; it was only a matter of "rhythmic-aesthetic exercises. What the "rhythmic-aesthetic exercises" looked like, the "Berliner Lokalanzeiger" knows to be misleading: "The exercises were performed by boys and girls together in a completely unclothed state. The public performance took place in the 254th Gemeindeschule in Wicleffstrasse, and it had been prepared by a youthful teacher in his mid-twenties. Children of all ages took part in the dances, and among the spectators were the parents of the children, male and female teachers, and also members of the community. The parents, however, seem to have been less than enthusiastic about these performances, for lively protests have been made against the unseemly "exercises".' After these things became known, the organizer, teacher Adolf Koch, was officially questioned by the provincial school board and suspended from his duties. Disciplinary proceedings with the aim of dismissal have been initiated against him. Koch has also organized such exercises with adults. It has also become known that young male and female teachers, among them Koch, met several times during the week and organized such exercises together, dressed in Adam and Eve costumes. The authorities will also take action against the participants in these meetings. The heads of the schools, the Socialist Principal Buchholz and the Socialist Principal Gerhardt, who gave permission for the use of the school rooms, will also face punishment."

Archbishop Söderblom: "We throw off the mask!" According to the "A. E. L. K.", "Auf der Warte" writes about the "Liberalization of the Swedish National Church": " " 'The Spiritual Present and the Church' is called a

book published by the Swedish Share Publishing House in Stockholm. It contains essays by sixteen persons well known in their fields: Writers, professors, lecturers, theologians, doctors and laymen. In some introductory words Archbishop D. Söderblom emphasizes, "We throw off the mask that unintentionally obscures and look at each other face to face." A postscript says: 'We are experiencing one of the most important hours in the life of our race, when the seriousness of life is strong enough to compel us to honest and manly confession.' But one is somewhat surprised at such confession, D. N. Beskow, for example, says: to Christianity belongs the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of JEsu's eternal divinity and supernatural birth as a man, the doctrine of his bodily resurrection and ascension into heaven, the doctrine that God punished him instead of men, since otherwise he could not possibly forgive men; to Christianity, finally, belongs also the belief in the devil and an eternal hell. And he continues, "One can be a Christian under certain circumstances without accepting these doctrines." Lecturer Em. Linderholm holds the creation story to be incompatible with the modern-scientific result. 'Man could not have been created as good and perfect and then sunk to a lower standpoint by the Fall. Archaeology and anatomy, on the contrary, would have proved that man, under a long period of development of perhaps ten thousand years, gradually rose to the present condition. Thus the doctrine of original sin falls. Therefore Christ is not necessary as the Redeemer. He is merely a man; His resurrection is denied. If Paul lays a decisive weight on the resurrection, this is merely an adaptation of the gospel of Jesus to the Hellenic-philosophical system. The miracle narratives are legends. The Apostles' Creed should be abolished. As the aim of the book, which, by the way, is the result of discussions of the authors, which the Archbishop attended as chairman, he states: an attempt to bring about an understanding between the religious and cultural views. To achieve this, another writer, representing the working world, proposes a "free church for free men": "The Bible is not God's word, but the most powerful poem of mankind. The doctrine of the forgiveness of sins is in some respects demoralizing. The religion of the church is gloomy; the figure of Christ on the cross is, after all, really a corpse, the symbol of death. The sermon in the service is dull and should be replaced by more music and singing.' "'One has,' says the same writer, 'the feeling that something new should also be created in the ecclesiastical field, and so it may happen that the church doors will soon open to let the masses in, to hear a new preaching/ The book has created a great stir and is already out of print in the first edition. It meets with sharp criticism in the Free Church press, which writes, among other things: 'The new conception of religion is a breakneck attempt to reshape the Gospel to suit the taste of the times.' Archbishop Söderblom delivered a lecture on the subject, which was awaited with great interest, in the crowded Engelbrekt Church in Stockholm on the second Easter holiday, 'Are we heading for a religious rebirth?' He found the book aiming at a positive purpose, and was sincerely grateful against any one who, without reservation, dealt with the burning questions to the best of his ability. "Changes must soon be made here

be undertaken, and therefore the book can only have a salutary and useful effect. All dogmas must fall as husks.' Speaker concluded: 'We are going towards a new birth of religion. In this I believe as firmly as in God. For God is now visiting the world. The question is not only to remove stones of offence, to purify and spiritualize religion, but whether our faith has the elemental power to take hold of souls, especially the masses who are now bursting forth into power and needing religion for their own part and for the sake of civilization. In other words, do we feel that the Lord is near? And do our hearts burn for him?' " I wonder if the leaders of the Augustana Synod might still be proud of the Swedish Archbishop? The Lutheran Church expects an open debate. In its January issue, the ***Lutheran Church Review*** also honors Söderblom by publishing his lecture on "Evangelic Catholicity" given at the Philadelphia Seminary on November 15, 1923, which nevertheless admits only a Unionist interpretation. The ***Review*** reprints the article without comment. The same applies to Söderblom's footnote, according to which the purpose of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, to be held in Stockholm in August 1925, is not organic union, but "joint action, cooperation on common clear lines in the burning moral problems of international and national life"; Söderblom is evidently in the service of the English. The expenses connected with his travels are to be paid by people from the League of Nations. By the way, as far as the mask is concerned, which Söderblom has now thrown off, it was only a thin veil for all those who had eyes to see. F. B.

Restriction of birth by physical means. How the Romans also adapt their morals to the spirit of the times concerning this question can be seen from an article by Leonard Hodgson (Magdalen College) in *The Hibbert Journal*, where it says, p. 74 et al. also says: "When, in spite of all the considerations that have been urged, men and women honestly believe themselves to be justified in the sight of God in using physical methods of birth-control, their consciences must be respected, and they must be assured that so long as they do what they believe to be right, they do what is pleasing to God and may continue to share freely in the communion of the Church. If they are wrong, they will come to see this, not through being hardened in opposition by excommunication, but through their sharing in the life of the Church. Only the Church must continue to preach that for the Christian the standard of life he must set before himself is the highest, and to proclaim to all men the possibility of this life through the gospel of freedom and power." Thus, in the hands of the Jesuits, the moral law becomes a waxen nose. F. B.

"Inward Overcoming of Liberalism." In the "Theologische Literaturblatt," edited by D. Ihmels and D. Böhmer, the paper ***Christianity and Liberalism*** by Dr. Machen is also reviewed. To the

In response to Machen's demand that a separation of the liberals from the Christian Church must take place, it is remarked: "In the first place, the time is not suitable for this with us [in Germany], since it is not possible without sharp struggles; and in the second place, it is not quite easy to draw an exact line for the separation. At present, therefore, it is to be regarded as the task set by God to overcome ecclesiastical liberalism inwardly (without, of course, tolerating obvious annoyances). . . . The accusation of dishonorable

to be, these [liberals] will firmly reject." So is practiced by Ihmels and all the national churchmen. One does not conform to Scripture, but to circumstances. God's Word demands separation from false spirits. One gets rid of this clear duty with the untrue, unfruitful phrase: "inwardly overcome." F. B.

Concerning liberalism, Volkelt says in his 1923 writing on "Schopenhauer": "Especially that kind of liberal Protestant Christianity which revels in enthusiasm for cultural progress and wants to make Christianity as harmless an appendage as possible to the life enjoyed with worldly pleasure, can, measured by Schopenhauer's standard, find no mercy". (391; cf. Th. d. Gegenw. 1924, 10.) F. B.

Rittelmeyer's "Christian Community" held its last meeting in Rostock. According to a report in the "A. E. L. K." (taken from the "Christliche Welt" 1923, No. 51 and 52), it represents the following basic ideas: "The cosmic attitude is the characteristic of the "Christengemeinschast". It sees man as a member of a cosmic world which is much richer than our sensual earth. It sees this in constant connection with another spiritual world, from which forces are constantly flowing into ours. But this earth has fallen into a disease of sin, not only men, but the whole of nature, even the minerals. (Proof e. g.: the heaviness of the stone!) But the cosmic creative power, the Logos, has become flesh, has flowed into this earth (in the first verses of John 1 lies the key to the whole New Testament!), is now working as a living power in this earth in a wonderful, logical development, which we should understand in its wise sense through the training of new, deeper methods of knowledge, until the Kingdom of God, the "transfigured" earth. And every man can participate in this development, can become a creative member of it, if he takes up the Christ-crast in himself: in the sacrament, in the cult, in the "consecration of man," which stands in the centre of the whole movement, as the new religious deed. And in this participation in the creative Christ-crast lies salvation for man. This Christ-filled humanity, transformed in the 'consecration act,' will also redeem nature, will bring a reshaping of our collapsing culture, indeed a solution of the social question out of the spirit." - In contrast to the theosophy of Blavatski and the anthroposophy of Rudolf Steiner, the rapture of Rittelmeyer (formerly a liberal theologian in Bavaria) can be called cosmosophy. F. B.

Concerning the Monist League, the champion of Monism, D. Drews, writes in the "History of Philosophy" (Vol. 9, p. 9): "Thus, for the time being, the common bond of the adherents of the Monist League consists only in the negation of all ideas of the hereafter, in the rejection of ecclesiastical dualism and its external cultural-political power, and [in] the belief in the original goodness of man [and] in the all-salvific power of science, which will sooner or later be able to bring about heaven on earth - a view which, with its intellectualistic attitude and its optimism, is admittedly more in keeping with the Enlightenment spirit of the 18th century than with the scientific philosophical worldview of the 19th century. This view, with its intellectual attitude and optimism, corresponds more to the spirit of the Enlightenment of the 18th century than to the scientific philosophical world view of the 19th and 20th centuries, and the world war may well have proved its untenability." The founder of the Monist League was the atheist Ernst Häckel, who died in 1919,

notorious also by his falsifications in the interest of his monkey descent theory. F. B.

Atheistic theory of evolution. D. Lemme writes in the "Spiritual Struggle" (p. 223): "Evolutionistic atheism, which believes in permanent further development, is in this belief as contradictory an entity as mechanistic evolutionism is in itself. Development, as Siebeck has also pointed out, is a teleological thought; and teleology floats in the air without a purposive mind. Even Kant, who anticipated evolutionism, saw that the thought of development presupposes the thought of preformation; but preformation contains in itself teleology. All development, moreover, includes progress in itself; and progress results in an optimism which, especially in Spencer, determines the whole view of the world and transcends naturalism. For naturalism knows nothing of value, and optimism assigns values to the course of the world. Here one sees clearly how the idea of development becomes a belief in development. Lamarck, too, subordinated development to the idea of God. Thus evolutionist atheism is a proof that atheism can never present itself in a fully pure culture, but must, in order not to become devoid of all human dignity, always combine itself with factors which somehow make the in itself spiritless view of life bearable. For a completely degodified world lacks all purposefulness. And yet one must embrace it if one is to retain the joyfulness of cooperation in future tasks." The atheistic doctrine of evolution is at variance not merely with the Bible and the facts of experience, but also with reason; for it is based on the denial of the proposition of causa sufficiens, and is founded on the delusion that nothing can of itself evolve into anything. The theistic theory of evolution does not deny the axiom: Ex nihilo nihil fit, for it places God as the cause at the head and in the course of development; but it too contradicts not only Scripture, but experience, for neither the present nor the past offers a single proof of the transition of any lower species into a higher one, but innumerable proofs of the old proposition: Species does not leave species. F. B.

Dr. Reinke on the knowledge of God from nature. The botanist and biologist Dr. J. Reinke (professor in the monastery of Preetz near Kiel) has repeatedly declared that the origin of life can only be regarded as a miracle of God. The seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the "Inner Mission" by Wichern on Steptember 23, 1848, prompted him again to make the following statement: "The most important natural scientists of all times have confessed the recognition of God. One of England's greatest physicists, Lord Kelvin, said in a speech in 1903: With regard to the origin of life, natural science affirms the intervention of a creative God-power; science compels everyone to acknowledge the miracle given in one's own existence. We know God only from his works, but through natural science we are forced to believe in his power with unconditional confidence. This is the subject on which the teachers of the Inner Mission should speak to the people in an enlightening way. They should proclaim again and again the unknown God. In doing so, they could take from the results of an unprejudiced and objectively judging biology the power to

task." (A. E. L. K., 629.) Certainly, theoretical atheism can also be combated by reason and science, for with a thousand fingers nature everywhere points to a personal and almighty God as its author. But this does not help; for that there is a God, the devils also believe. Conscience tells man that he is a sinner and under the wrath of God. Is this so? What is the mind of God toward me, whom his own conscience condemns? This is the question of all questions to which man must have an answer. But science, with its telescopes, microscopes, spectroscopes, etc., is unable to find it. Nature remains as mute as the Sphinx. The answer can only be found in the divine revelation in the Holy Scriptures, in the Gospel of Christ, the Saviour of sinners. Whoever, therefore, is in any way concerned with missions cannot be satisfied with Reinke's advice. If he really wants to help poor sinners, he must know and preach the Gospel - the all-salvific truth, which is also indispensable to scholars like Dr. Reinke. F. B.

Absolution in confession and the Lord's Supper. In the "A. E. L. K." we read: The "Kirchl. Anzeiger für Württemberg" brings the following note on "Communion and Confession": "Shortly after Prof. D. Wurster snatched from us, I read again in his "Glaubens- und Sittenlehre" (Doctrine of Faith and Morals): "A grievous grievance, which could only be remedied by a thorough change in our order of confession, consists in the fact that in absolution that is already pronounced and granted which after all constitutes the content of the good to be enjoyed afterwards in the Lord's Supper, so that the forgiveness of sins is to be assigned and appropriated twice in succession, each time in a solemn congregational act...". Likewise, in Schöll's "Der evang. Glaube" (The Protestant Faith) we read: "It becomes clear that the absolution which conventionally precedes the Lord's Supper contradicts the meaning of the Lord's Supper in a straightforward manner. For the Lord's Supper itself is absolution, the testimony of the forgiveness of sins.'" We add: "If the confession which precedes the Absolut is of the right kind, it too is essentially the presentation of the forgiveness of sins. Furthermore, if the main sermon preceding the celebration of the Lord's Supper is an evangelical one (as it ought to be), it too is not presenting any good other than the forgiveness of sins. Forgiveness of sins is the good of all goods. He who has it has everything; without it no other good can really be had. Where there is forgiveness of sins, Luther says, there is also life and blessedness. Forgiveness is the one thing that the Christian always and everywhere needs. This good is therefore offered to him again and again and in various forms. Luther says in the Schmalkaldic Articles: The Gospel "does not give counsel and help against sin in one way; for God is abundantly rich in his grace: first, by the oral word, wherein is preached forgiveness of sins in all the world, which is the proper office of the Gospel; secondly, by baptism; thirdly, by the holy sacrament of the altar; fourthly, by the power of the keys, and also per mutuum colloquium et consolationem fratrum, Matth. 18: Ubi duo fuerint congregati etc." The "Kirchl. Anzeiger" thinks that the matter is worthy of being thoroughly discussed once. We think so too. But it will be difficult to arrive at a better answer than Luther gives in the passage quoted and in other passages. F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. **May 1924.** **No. 5.**

Christian Dogmatics by D. Franz Pieper.

Volume I.*)

Preface.

With the appearance of this volume, my "Christian Dogmatics" is now available in full print. It has been publicly asked why the second and third volumes appeared first. The reason is that the desire was expressed that in the great Jubilee year of 1917 the volume in which the teachings of God's grace in Christ, of Christ's person and work, and of justification are presented should be printed first. The second volume was naturally followed by the third volume, in which the consequences of the Christian doctrine of justification are described.

In the present volume, the first two chapters, "The Nature and Concept of Theology" and "Sacred Scripture," occupy more than half of the space. This is explained by the fact that in modern Protestant theology un-Christian ideas of the nature and concept of theology have become established. But this is only the necessary consequence of the apostasy from the Christian truth that the Holy Scriptures are God's own infallible Word. As we have before us in the Roman Church a complete collapse of Christian theology in principle, because there the subjective view of the Pope is the all-determining power, so we now have the same state of affairs in modern Protestant theology, because this

*The following "Preface" is taken from the first volume of the "Christian Dogmatics" by D. Franz Pieper, with which the entire great work is now completed. We are also reprinting the "Table of Contents" in order to give an insight into the abundance of thoughts in this volume as well. Our readers will all rejoice with us and thank God that He has granted the venerable author grace for the happy completion of his magnificent work, which is nothing other than a clear, powerful confession of the eternal divine truth in the madness and confusion of our time. May God now also grant zeal and ability for the study of it everywhere! F. B.

has abandoned the objective divine authority of Scripture and has taken refuge in the "Christian experience," that is, in the subjective view of "the theologizing subject." This explains, as has been said, the detailed treatment of the first two chapters. In the case of the doctrine of God, the difference between the natural and the Christian knowledge of God had to be presented in greater detail, because modern theology, even into circles calling themselves Lutheran, has become dynamistic-unitarian. In the doctrine of man, the doctrine of sin required longer expositions at several points, because modern theology, from its ego standpoint, has come to the concept of "blameless sin" in Roman Zwinglian fashion. In order to remain in the necessary contact with the present, it was therefore necessary to give special emphasis to certain passages in this volume.

On the other hand, it requires a special explanation, resp. excuse, why on p. 182 ff. a longer explanation is inserted, which actually does not belong in a dogmatics. It concerns the accusation, raised especially from Germany also in dogmatic writings, that within the Missouri Synod a "theology of repristination" is cultivated, which must be regarded as an evil in the Christian Church. Our theology, it is claimed, as a result of the "identification" of Scripture and God's Word, leads to an "intellectualism" in which living "heart Christianity" cannot really arise. Following this criticism, and in order to possibly remove the fear of "Repristination Theology", I had to describe at length how things are in our ecclesial community that is devoted to "Repristination Theology". In order to remain historically correct, I could not conceal the further fact that the theology deplored at the Missouri Synod is also cultivated with clear consciousness in other ecclesial communities. I refer to D. Hönecke's very detailed "Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik", from which it is evident that the doctrinal position of the Synod of Wisconsin, etc., coincides completely with the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod. In this digression there are further to be found (pp. 199 ff.) some quotations from a paper published by Franz Delitzsch in 1839 on the occasion of the tercentenary of the Reformation in the city of Leipzig. The purpose of these quotations is to prove that the American Lutheran Church of "strict confessional tendency" has preserved, brought to clear exposition, and practically applied what God gave now nearly a hundred years ago also in Germany. Delitzsch says-to take some of his sentences over into this preface-"I confess, without being ashamed, that in matters of faith I am three hundred years behind, because after long insanity I have recognized that the truth is but one, and an eternal, unchangeable one, and, because revealed by God, is in no need of sifting and improvement." "I preach

you regress, namely, to the word of God from which you have fallen." "What I have pronounced and sought to defend is nothing other than the faith of the Old Lutheran Church, to which our forefathers confessed three hundred years ago on the holy feast of Pentecost, with fervent prayer of thanksgiving." And Delitzsch was not alone. The author of this Dogmatics read some of Ernst Sartorius' smaller writings with great interest and true heartfelt joy while he was still a student, later as a pastor, and even still as a teacher of theology. These are the writings "Religion Outside the Limits of Mere Reason" (1822), "The Unscientificness and Inner Affinity of Rationalism and Romanism" (1826), "Of the Religious Principle of Knowledge" (1826). In these writings the right kind of Christian theology is dogmatically pointed out even more clearly than in Delitzsch. Modern German theology should not be deterred from reading these and other writings, which date from Germany's revival a hundred years ago, by the fact that their authors, under the pressure of an unscientific theological science, later deviated from the truth they had testified to.

In the present volume, too, I have endeavored to give a factual account. Where sharp expressions have been used in some places, they seemed to be demanded by the importance of the matter under discussion. It was necessary to show that a theology which seeks to derive and standardize Christian doctrine not from the Holy Scriptures alone, but from the ego of the theologizing individual, is neither Christian nor scientific, but the opposite of both. That I know of a theological inconsistency, according to which there is the possibility that someone believes differently in his heart and before God than he writes in his writings, is also repeatedly expressed in this volume.

We American Lutherans of "strict confessional tendency" have not the slightest cause to exalt ourselves above others. We would certainly be swimming in the same increased stream if God's grace had not placed us in quite different ecclesiastical circumstances. We-the second and third generations-have been theologically trained under the most favorable circumstances imaginable. We were acquainted not only with the theology of the ancient Church, the Reformation and the dogmatists, but also with the nature and results of modern theology. To this was added the continuing admonition on the part of our teachers not to substitute any human authority, not even the authority of Luther and the symbolic books, for the divine authority of Scripture. The admonition in the last year of study was: "Let no one of you enter the preaching ministry who still has doubts about the scriptural validity of any teaching of the Lutheran symbols. Those who still have doubts

let him converse frankly with any of his teachers." From the very first sermon in the first year of study, the learned sounding theological phrase and all rhetoric shooting into the weeds was ruthlessly eliminated and cut away on the grounds that the usus didacticus of the Holy Scriptures was paramount. It is important to teach and preach in such a way that, as far as the pastor is concerned, through the unabridged preaching of the law, the secure are roused from their carnal security, and the frightened consciences are assured of God's grace and salvation through the unvarnished gospel (satisfactio vicaria). The fact that we had enemies all around us at all times, from Rome, the enthusiastic sects and unfaithful Lutherans down to the Unitarians and the anti-Christian lodges, had to serve us best. This struggle forced us to continue our intense study of Christian doctrine in individual congregations, pastoral conferences, and synodal meetings. Admittedly, we would have to be blind if we did not also see the weaknesses that have always been inherent in our ecclesial community. We have had and continue to have difficulty in carrying out, or rather maintaining, right practice in individual congregations. We have also experienced secessions that have humbled us deeply. On the other hand, by God's grace, we are certain that the doctrine that is in force among us is the Christian doctrine revealed in Scripture and testified to in the Lutheran Confession, and must therefore lay claim to exclusive authority. From this point of view, this "Christian Dogmatics" also wants to be judged, both in its thetical and in its antithetical expositions.

Soli Deo Gloria!

St. Louis, Mo. in April, 1924. F. Beeper.

Synopsis.

The nature and concept of theology.
(De Natura et Constitutione Theologiae.)

1. the understanding of the point of view, p. 1. - 2. religion in general, p. 6. - 3. the number of religions in the world, p. 8. - 4. the two sources of knowledge of the religions actually existing, p. 19. - 5. the cause of parties in external Christianity, p. 22. - 6. Christianity as an absolute religion, p. 36. - 7. Christian religion and Christian theology, p. 42. - 8. Christian theology, p. 44. - 9. The nearer description of theology, conceived as efficiency, p. 50. - 10. The nearer description of theology, conceived as doctrine, p. 56. - 11. Divisions of theology, conceived as doctrine, p. 84. Law and gospel, p. 84. Fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, p. 89. Primary and secondary fundamental doctrines, pp. 95. non-fundamental doctrines, p. 102. open questions and theological problems, p. 104. - 12. the church and ecclesiastical dogmas, p. 108. - 13. the end which theology seeks to accomplish in men, p. 116. - 14. the outward means

of theology, whereby it attains its end in man, p. 118. - 15. theology and science, p. 119. - 16. theology and certainty, p. 123. - 17. theology and the training of teachers, p. 147. - 18. theology and freedom of teaching, p. 154. - 19. theology and system, p. 158. - 20. theology and method, p. 172. - 21. the attainment of theological proficiency, p. 228.

The Holy Scriptures. (**De Scriptura Sacra.**.)

1. the Holy Scriptures are, for the Church of our time, the only source and standard of Christian doctrine, p. 233; - 2. the Holy Scriptures, as distinguished from all other writings, are God's Word, p. 256; - 3. the Holy Scriptures are God's Word, because they are inspired or inspired by God, p. 262; - 4. the relation of the Holy Spirit to the writers of the Holy Scriptures, p. 275; - 5. the fact that the Holy Scriptures are not inspired by God, p. 275. The Objections to the Inspiration of the Scriptures, p. 280 (the different style in the several books of Scripture; the appeal to historical research; the different readings; alleged contradictions and erroneous statements; inaccurate quotations of the New Testament writers from the Old Testament; slight things and things not decent to the Holy Spirit; solecisms, barbarisms, missed sentence constructions). - 6. historical facts concerning the doctrine of inspiration, p. 320. - 7. Luther and the inspiration of Scripture, p. 334. - 8. summary characterization of recent theology in so far as it denies the inspiration of Scripture, p. 360. - 9. the consequences of the denial of inspiration, p. 367. - 10. the properties of Scripture, p. 371 (divine authority, p. 371; divine power, p. 381; perfection, p. 383; distinctness, p. 386). - 11. the historical testimony of Scripture, p. 398 (homologumena and antilegomena). - 12. the integrity of the biblical text, p. 408. - 13. Scripture in the basic text and translations, p. 415. - 14. the use of Scripture to decide doctrinal disputes, p. 422. - 15. the authority of Scripture and symbols, p. 427.-16. Scripture and exegesis, p. 434.

The Doctrine of God, (De Deo.)

1st The Natural Knowledge of God, p. 445. - 2nd The Christian Knowledge of God, p. 451. - 3rd The Church's Struggle for the Christian Knowledge of God, p. 457 (the struggle against the deniers of the three Persons, p. 459). - 4. the struggle against the deniers of the one God, p. 461. - 5. objections to homoufia, or the unity of God, p. 466. - 6. the doctrine of the holy Trinity in the Old Testament, p. 474. - 7. the incomprehensibility of the Trinity to human reason, p. 480. - 8. the ecclesiastical terminology in the service of the Christian knowledge of God, p. 490.

More detailed exposition of the Scriptural doctrine of God's essence and attributesDe essentia et attributis divinis. A. The relation of the divine essence to the divine attributes, and of the attributes to each other, p. 524. B. Various divisions of the divine attributes, p. 533. - Negative attributes, whereby imperfections found in creatures are negated by God: unity, p. 536; simplicity, p. 538; immutability, p. 540; infinity, p. 542; omnipresence, p. 543; eternity, p. 547. Positive attributes, which are also found in creatures, but which belong to God in absolute perfection: Life, p. 549; knowledge, p. 549; wisdom, p. 556; mind and will in God, p. 557; the holiness of God, p. 561; justice, p. 561; truthfulness, p. 563; power, p. 564; God's goodness, mercy, love, grace, meekness, p. 565.

The Creation of the World and of Man. (De Creatione.)

1. the source of knowledge of the doctrine of creation, p. 570. 2. the nature and concept of creation, p. 571. 3. the period of creation, p. 572. 4. the order in the work of creation, p. 572. 5. the work of creation in detail according to days, p. 574. dichotomy and trichotomy, p. 581. unity of the human race, p. 582. particulars of the biblical account of creation, p. 583. final purpose of the world, p. 585. concluding remarks, p. 586.

Divine Providence, or the Preservation and Government of the World, (De Providentia Dei.)

1. the notion of divine providence, and objections to it, p. 587. 2. the relation of divine providence to the causae secundae, p. 592. 3. divine providence and sin, p. 595. 4. divine permission of sin, p. 596. 5. divine providence and human freedom, p. 597.

The Angels. (De Angelis.)

1. the existence of angels, and the time of their creation, p. 603; 2. the name of angels, p. 603; 3. the nature and faculties of angels, p. 604; 4. the number of angels, and differences among them, p. 609; 5. good and evil angels, p. 610; 6. the good angels, and their uses; p. 611; 7. the evil angels, their uses, and their eternal punishment, p. 613.

The doctrine of man. (Anthropologia.)

A. Man before the fall (De statu hominis ante lapsum): 1. creation in the divine image, p. 617. - 2. the content of the divine image, p. 618. - 3. image of God in the wider and proper sense, p. 621. - 4. the relation of the divine image to human nature, p. 622. - 5. immediate consequences of the divine image in man, p. 624. - 6. the final end of the divine image, p. 625. - 7. woman and the divine image, p. 626. - **B. Man after the fall** (De statu peccati), Sin in general (De peccato in genere): 1. the notion of sin, p. 631. - 2. law and sin, p. 633. - 3. The knowledge of the divine law which binds all men, p. 635. - 4. The cause of sin, p. 638. - 5. The consequences of sin, p. 641. - Original sin (De peccato originali): 1. The notion of original sin, p. 645. - 2. The effect of original corruption from the mind and will of man, p. 652. - 3. The negative and positive side of hereditary corruption, p. 656. - 4. The subject of hereditary corruption, p. 659. - 5. The consequences of hereditary corruption, p. 661. - The sins of fact: 1. Name and notion of sins of fact, p. 669. - 2. The causes of sins of fact: Causae peccati actualis intra hominem, g. 670; causae peccati actualis extra hominem, p. 671. - 3. The Scripture doctrine of offence, p. 672. - 4. The Scripture doctrine of temptation, p. 674. - 5. Classifications and denominations of the sins of fact, p. 675 (a. Distinction of the sins of fact according to the different participation of the human will, p. 676; b. the peccata actualia in relation to conscience, p. 677; c. Classification of sins according to object, p. 678; d. Classification of sins according to degree, p. 678; e. peccata mortalia et venalia, p. 680; f. ruling and non-ruling sin, p. 681; g. participation in other people's sins, p. 681; h. sky-scraping sins [peccata clamantia], p. 682; i. the sin against the Holy Spirit, p. 683).

On the evaluation of the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach.

(Continuation instead of conclusion.)

The World Convention in Eisenach, we judged, could not have been attended by us Missourians. As it was planned and held, it presupposed a unity that did not exist. Admittedly, it said, "We are united in the faith and confession of the fathers." He who says does not make being. And who believed it, and could believe it, in view of the numerous differences in doctrine and practice actually existing among the delegates as well as in the churches they represented? "Luther and I," declared also Zwingli at Marburg in 1529, "Luther and I have one faith in JEsus Christ our Lord, and in Him." Luther, however, could not accept this; on the contrary, he saw himself compelled to refuse Zwingli the brotherly hand. Things were not essentially different in Eisenach.

Particular praise was given to the fraternal intercourse at the World Convention. In one report it says: "What was especially good for us in Eisenach, and what should be especially emphasized in all reports," was "the cordial, fraternal intercourse among the participants. We have . . . . enjoyed hours and days of fellowship which refreshed us immensely." (L. u. W. 1924, p. 67.) We can understand this, especially in view of all the lying and haffing Against the Germans in and after the World War. But even apart from the liberal spirits, we could not have welcomed and treated the Lutherans of all shades who had come together in Eisenach without further ado as Lutheran brothers in the faith, against whom there was nothing grave, inhibiting the brotherhood. As things stood, we should rather have declared openly to the great majority of them: You want to be Lutherans, but so far you have not taken your Lutheranism seriously; you are entangled in indifferentism and unionism; you pay homage to doctrines and practices that are contrary to Scripture and the Confession; all this must change if there is to be proper brotherly recognition and fellowship between us.

Furthermore, we would not have organized or participated in the communal devotions, church services and celebrations. Like fraternal intercourse, they presuppose unity of faith. They are justified only as activities of such really existing unity. Lutherans who organize them thereby declare: We are united in all that is necessary for church fellowship according to Scripture and confession. In these services the delegates collectively confessed the Christian faith and Luther's Declaration on the Second Article; they sang "Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott," "Herz und Herz vereint zusammen," etc. Thus can and should

People sing and confess, united in spirit and faith, but rightly and in truth only these. "We are all right some brethren in the faith!" That was what the delegates were calling out to each other and to Christendom through these services. This is how these services were understood. The rejoicing over the "brotherly unity of faith" in Eisenach was based on them.

But was this unity really there? That it did not exist, we have shown in the previous article. But if it was absent, the services and celebrations which they proclaimed were untrue, un-Lutheran, unionistic. We Missourians, at least, had we attended them, would thereby have pretended to a unity which, after all, we would have known did not exist. The testimony of truth, even the most beautiful and the best, is weakened, sinks to a dull lip-work, if behind the mouth confession does not stand the deed confession, if through anticipation of the church fellowship the seriousness of the testimony given for the truth is taken away.

In Eisenach, however, people thought differently, they found it quite natural that the program also included communal celebrations etc. The vast majority of delegates who came to the World Convention consider all the differences that exist in world Lutheranism to be insignificant and irrelevant for any kind of church fellowship, and probably the majority of them do not even shy away from prayer, worship, pulpit and even communion even with non-Lutherans. The representatives from the national churches, from the Unions, from Sweden, from the United Lutheran Church, from the Augustan Synod - they all more or less cultivate brotherhood in the faith with false teachers of all kinds, with Uniate, Reformed, Anglican, and so on. How should they not, in Eisenach, without all concern for differences, have immediately fallen into the arms of the brethren, and without further ado proceeded to the exercise of hearty, intimate unity of faith in corporate worship!

Yes, these Unionists think that they can not only do all this with a good conscience, but that they also owe it to themselves, and that they must demand the same from other Lutherans. They are surprised, displeased, even bitter and spiteful, when they hear that there are Lutherans, Missourians, who condemn such brotherhood and love festivals as unionism and do not want to take part in them. "We heard with uneasiness," writes even Gußmann, "that there is no pulpit and altar fellowship between the United Lutheran Church of North America and individual synods represented at Eisenach [Ohio and Iowa]." (L. u. W. 90.) Displeasure, bitterness, spite-Missouri has experienced it, and still gets to enjoy it. But even such displeasure does not remove the fact that at the World Convention the unity which the fraternal intercourse and celebrations proclaimed to all the world was not in truth before-

The Lutheran confession and the commandment of truthfulness could not be accepted by the Scriptures and the Lutheran confession.

Not long after the conclusion of the World Convention, D. Reu: "Beware also fearfully of any step that presupposes in any degree the pulpit and altar fellowship of the circles involved, which after all does not exist. Otherwise, over there, the Lutheran Federation and the Free Church must resign, or a number of the American synods cannot participate either." (L. u. W., p. 24.) 11) We hold that even a fraternal intercourse and fellowship of worship, as maintained at Eisenach, is mutual public ecclesiastical recognition, and presupposes unity of faith. Had we been able to go along with these pieces, we would have conscientiously stopped short of pulpit fellowship and not even of full organic union.

"There was heard at Eisenach," says one report, "even the most flagrant unionism." What is meant is, that there was no lack of public discussions in favor of a union of all Lutherans, such as they are, even of all Protestants in the world. We think that such a unionism was already present in Eisenach, not only expressed there, but in practice.

11) In Eisenach, D. Reu declared: We "do not know ourselves to be in pulpit and altar fellowship, this closest form of church fellowship, with those [United Lutheran Church] who refuse to take seriously also in the piece [rejection of the secus docentes] of the Reformation confession in church life". (L. u. W. 1923, p. 361.) But do the Lutheran Federation and the "Free Church" really stand as Reu seems to assume above? Do the pastors of the Lutheran Federation, or some of them, not maintain church fellowship with the national churches? In the organ of the Lutheran Federation, Gußmann rebukes the delegates of the Iowa and Ohio Synods for sitting "at the same table" with the representatives of the United Lutheran Church at the World Convention and yet not being in pulpit and altar fellowship with them in America. (L. u. W. 1924, p. 90.) It would seem to follow from this that Gußmann thinks it quite all right for all who were present at Eisenach to enter into pulpit and altar fellowship with one another, that is, to do precisely what Reu warns against. Nor will the executive of the World Convention care much for the warning. At the very first meeting of the same, from the 8th to the 10th of December last, at Copenhagen, Morehead, Ihmels, and Pehrsson (who took the place of Bishop Rundgren) preached in the churches there. In what way is this somehow essentially different from pulpit fellowship? The members of the executive will not be deterred from the pulpit fellowship, to which they have long been accustomed in the most extended degree. After all, if we look at it closely, the communal services in Eisenach, at which Stub, Raffery, Traub, Ihmels, and Jacobs served as preachers, were also pulpit fellowship! As things stand at present, a brotherly world convention of all Lutherans involves from the outset every form of church fellowship.

was communicated. After all, the great majority of the delegates with whom one cultivated religious brotherhood in Eisenach had long since been in actual and, to a large extent, official church fellowship with the Reformed! And men like Söderblom can surely no longer be regarded as Lutherans, but only as Protestants. If, as in Eisenach, Söderblom is admitted to the brotherhood, to what Protestants, rationalists, and modernists may the door then be closed?

Certainly, under certain circumstances we ourselves could hold meetings with people like Harnack, Kaftan, and Söderblom in order to win them over to the truth, communicate with them politely and lovingly, negotiate theologically with them, and occasionally even be present as spectators and observers at a service that they are holding. But to associate with them as members of a convent in a brotherly way (recognizing each other as brothers in the faith) and to organize and hold services together, that we would consider blatant unionism. And to sit on the platform with Stub and Knubel next to Söderblom at such services would be impossible for us. By doing so we would help to put an orthodox cloak on this modernist, to put a Lutheran mask on him. By doing so, we would publicly give this seducer and destroyer of Christianity the untrue testimony that he is also a faithful Lutheran and brother in the faith who stands with us in the right unity of the Spirit.

Even the act of confession at the Wartburg, which at the same time wants to be interpreted as a mutual declaration of orthodoxy by the Eisenach delegates, we would not have been able to organize in community with Lutherans of all directions and shades. Not even with people of the United Lutheran Church, whom we do not, like some in Eisenach, deny Lutheranism in every respect, would we be able to agree to a convention if public activity of the brotherhood of faith and anticipation of church fellowship through jointly organized services were the condition. The activity of unity must not precede unity in doctrine and practice, if it is not otherwise to become untrue in itself and encourage indifferentism and unionism.

At Eisenach the same indifferentism and unionism prevailed which Missouri has fought from the beginning, especially at the General Synod, the General Council, and the synods which now form the United Lutheran Church, as a deadly cancer on the body of modern Christianity, as the process of disintegration which, if not arrested, will destroy Lutheranism in America also, and finally deliver our church to sectarianism and unbelief. The promoters of the World Convention were known as unionists, indifferentists. From the very beginning, therefore

things were also such that Eisenach could have no attraction for Lutherans who see in unity in truth the goal to be striven for everywhere by the church, but only for those who consider temporal peace and outward union to be the highest good of the church and think, believe, that in spite of existing differences they need only come together, only travel to Eisenach, to find each other as brothers in the faith, to embrace each other, and to join together in brotherly fellowship and church work.

Missouri did not sit in the World Convention, nor did it belong in it, as it was planned and held. We would not have been able to promote the Eisenach type of symphony. Had we been represented, we would have considered it our first task to destroy the delusion of the already existing unity "in the faith and confession of the fathers" and to put down all unionistic being based on this false premise, - in order to at least clear the way for an attempt at real unity and godly harmony. F. B.

(To be continued.)

The Gospel in the Land of the Inquisition.

In 1855, Francisco de Paulo Ruét, a young Spaniard, while traveling in Italy, heard the Gospel preached by a former Roman priest. Powerfully moved by it, he obtained a New Testament and read it secretly and assiduously. Thus he came to the knowledge of the beatific truth, and soon became a witness of it in his native land. Although there was no freedom of religion in Spain, not even toleration for Protestants, and therefore persecution was to be expected, he took advantage of a favorable political situation and appeared publicly in Barcelona as a preacher of the Gospel. He was immediately summoned by the bishop to appear before his spiritual tribunal, which he refused to acknowledge and despised by failing to appear. For this he was condemned to death in absentia by this spiritual court, although he lacked the power to execute this sentence. Now he was brought before the secular court and sentenced by it to banishment for life. He went first to Gibraltar and later to Algiers, eating the bread of misery, but trusting in God to let him preach the gospel once more in his homeland. This hope was fulfilled thirteen years later.

While Ruét was staying in Gibraltar, a young Spanish officer once strolled through the streets there, saw a Protestant English chapel, and entered it to learn about an English church service. To his astonishment, however, a

Spanish, Rüst, in Spanish language. The sermon made an impression on him, he discussed it further with the preacher and also continued his own research in the Scriptures. Thus he, Manuel Matamoros, also came to the realization that man is justified before God "without works of the law, but by faith alone", Rom 3:28. 3:28. Returning to Spain, he worked in silence for the Gospel among his friends. To be safe from spies, they gathered around a set table to read the Bible, while outside a boy kept watch and blew a whistle when a suspect approached. Nevertheless they were discovered, and Matamoros and a number of his friends were sentenced to seven to nine years in the galleys or penitentiary for the crime of reading the Bible. This, however, worked a tremendous indignation in all Protestant countries. Letters of protest and indignation with many signatures were sent to the Spanish government from all sides; Protestant princes made emphatic representations to Queen Jsabella; indeed, an address emanating from Catholics in Holland demanded of her as much liberty for Protestants in Spain as Catholics possessed in Holland. For the sake of this general indignation, and in order not to lose altogether the good will of foreign countries, the penitentiary sentence was changed into banishment. But in 1868 Queen Isabella was driven out, and the new government declared that non-Catholics should have liberty to hold religious services. When the fugitive queen's train arrived in Pan, France, a train was already waiting on another track to take Bibles and Bible messengers to Spain. Matamoros also returned to his fatherland as an evangelist.

The alleged freedom of religion granted in 1868 was limited in 1876 to mere toleration of dissenters, and it has remained so to this day. Spain is still the only country in Europe where there is no legal freedom of religion, and all sorts of persecutions of Protestants when they come out publicly as such and practice their religion freely are still the order of the day.

But especially from England and Germany the evangelization in Spain was started since 1868 with great difficulties. The influx of the curious among the Spaniards was at first very great, many an Englishman already dreamed of a great spread of the Protestant religion in Spain; but persecutions soon sifted the wheat from the chaff. At least there are now scattered Protestant congregations in all the provinces, which gradually united to form a united Protestant national church (Iglesia Evangelica Espanola). Fritz Fliedner (born June 10, 1845, died April 25, 1901) played an outstanding part in the gathering of this Spanish Evangelical Church. He was a Union man and as such not clear and firm in the right doctrine despite his

undeniably very great missionary zeal. And therefore he worked unhesitatingly hand in hand with reformed sects.

Fritz Fliedner, who had already looked around ecclesiastically in Spain before, was sent to Spain in 1870 by a Berlin committee for evangelization. He found four small evangelical churches already in Madrid, the capital, and joined the one led by Ruét. Very soon the leadership passed into his hands. In 1872 a German schoolman, Heinrich Ruppert, was sent from Berlin to help him, and together they started a series of elementary schools. From the beginning a moderate school fee was charged in these evangelization schools, in order to cover the costs; all efforts of the Jesuits to lure the children away from them into the State Free Schools were in the end always in vain. Things were just too bad for these State Free Schools. But the competition of the evangelization schools caused the Spaniards to increase and raise their own schools.

Because there was a lack of perfect textbooks even for secular subjects, Fliedner founded a bookstore (Libreria National y Extranjera) in 1873. In the course of time it published about 100 books in Spanish, both religious and non-religious. It also supplied the educated Spaniards with better foreign literature, namely in German, English and also French.

Fliedner had to open an orphanage in Madrid and, because it was not enough to cope with the misery of the children, a rest home for sick city children in the Eskorial near Madrid. This was set up in a garden house with a garden in which the Protestant murderer King Philip II had once lived with eight monks until his palace monastery was built.

In order to bring the Gospel to the educated in Spain, a grammar school (college) with boarding house was built in 1897, with great difficulty. First, it was difficult to collect the necessary sums of money, and then the Catholic dignitaries backed the government; even Pope Leo XIII wrote a letter to the Queen Mother to prevent this construction under any pretext. It did not succeed, however. Many former students of this college are now working in government offices and other influential positions in public life, seeking to counteract Spanish intolerance of Protestants. For evangelism itself, however, this expensively built and expensively operated educational institute has been of little use. First of all, it is not intended to be a preacher's preparatory school, and secondly, Spain still lacks a theological seminary for the actual training of native preachers after they have graduated from this high school. That is, besides

the lack of pure teaching, the second main damage to the work of evangelization in Spain begun from Germany. It is a pity about all the money that was spent for this grammar school. Until the outbreak of the war it stood there free of debt, then it was burdened with debt in order to be able to continue the other work. Now it is in constant danger that the Jesuits will buy it over the heads of the Protestants if the sums for the interest payments do not come in from abroad.

When Fritz Fliedner first came to Madrid, he was to find a German-French Protestant congregation there as well as the four Spanish congregations. But when the Franco-German war broke out, the French pastor at the time had turned to Algiers, and the members of the congregation had lost their way. Fliedner became a voluntary and unpaid embassy preacher, his salary being provided by the Gustav-Adolf-Verein. Bismarck twice offered him official appointment and salary for this post, but Fliedner turned it down so as not to be hindered in his main work, evangelism. In the beginning, he had to gather the members of a German congregation, and as long as he lived, this congregation did not develop into an actual organization. It was only after his death that his son, Theodor Fliedner, with the help of the then German Consul, Dr. Perl, was able to organize a "properly functioning" German Protestant congregation in 1902. The German Emperor, Wilhelm II, gave it 30,000 marks toward a beautiful church built to his own designs, with a parsonage next to it. The first pastor, Jakob Heep, returned to Germany after only six months, the second, Wilhelm Albrecht, presided over it for about twenty years and died at the end of 1922. It is not known whether the congregation' has already been resupplied. This German congregation is no longer connected with the evangelistic work as such.

Portugal used to be part of the country of the Inquisition. The threads of the evangelistic work also run from Spain to Portugal, but we do not know more about this connection. In Lisbon there had been an evangelical congregation since 1750, which in 1856 submitted itself to the Berlin Oberkirchenrat in order to obtain a pastor. For 1883 250 members, including 10 Dutch and 20 Portuguese, were given; at that time a pastor Bindseil served this congregation. Whether it is still in existence, served or un-served, is not known. In general, the evangelization in Portugal must be less good than in Spain, because one can hardly read anything about it.

The direction of the German Evangelisation Work is at present in the hands of Fr Theodor Fliedner, 63 Bravo Murillo, Madrid. However, since this work can no longer be supported from Germany

the time is not far off when the Spanish Protestant Church will have to carry on independently the whole work of evangelization. Will it be able to do so? *) Theo. Hanssen.

*) In No. 153 of "Blätter aus Spanien" Theo. Fliedner wrote about the help for the mission in Spain: "When I was in Holland during the last months, a friend said to me quite comfortably: 'I thought your work in Spain had died! Thank God, that is not yet the case, in spite of all the hardships. Admittedly, the half a million that is ready for us in Germany is not worth much; in the past we could have carried on the work for five years with it, now it is barely enough for two [?] days. Donations still come from Germany, and as we cannot possibly exchange 500 marks sent by a lady from Dresden, or 500 marks from a harvest festival collection into a peseta (formerly 80 pf.), we regard them as savings until better times come. In the meantime we have excepted mortgages, sold properties, made savings, and thirst abundantly experienced the help of friends in Switzerland, America, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. - In America our fellow tribesmen have not forgotten us, and the National Lutheran Council with its worthy chairman, Dr. Lauritz Larsen in New York, generously granted 17,500 pesetas in December of last year, so that we were able to pay the interest on our mortgage debt outright. In June, of course, we had the same need. I said to myself: God can probably give you twenty friends in Switzerland, each of whom will give you 1000 francs. He didn't. We just don't want to think that God has to help us just as we imagine; but he did help. In Basle, Berne, and Zurich, friends are juggling by fortune, yes, by fortune; a lady who has lived long in America gave 1000 francs, a colonel as much, and a psarrer also 1000 francs, a master plumber 500, and when I sent the last cheque from Berne on the 26th of June, which could arrive before the fatal date, and converted the sums sent into pesetas, it was just what we needed to pay the mortgage interest! It is a small thing to the Lord to help by much or little! God greet you, dear givers, and reward you a thousand times over! - During the summer, my brother, Fr. Hans Fliedner, as an emissary of the Iglesia Evangelii" Espanola in Copenhagen, was also able to experience much love and participation, and in Christiania and Stockholm he met warm friends of the work. One lady even gave him 1000 crowns, and what was most important, he was able to experience the fellowship of the saints in a touching way, so that he returned strengthened and comforted to his work in the Spanish congregation in Madrid. - In the fall I had to go to Holland again for the collection drive. In Zeist with the dear widow of our former Father Kleinschmidt, in the circle of the Brethren, in Utrecht, Amsterdam, Hague and Rotterdam, I was again, as eighteen months before, given a warm and hearty welcome, and again I was able to cover the lousy expenses in Madrid with the gifts I received. But - the mortgage interest! It was not enough, although a dear friend, Father van Dyk, the director of the boarding school in Zeist, collected over 2500 guilders himself. I couldn't help thinking of a saying of my father's, once told to me by a brother minister in Germany: 'That God will help us out of difficulties is certain; I am only curious how He will do it this time.' And lo and behold, on the 24th in the morning, just in time to be home for Christmas Eve, I arrive in Madrid from Holland, and my brother, Fr. Georg Fliedner, the head of the Gymnasium, tells me that Mr. Bowers, the representative of the American Board in Spain, had asked him in Barcelona how he could help us. My brother said that he could help us with an interest-free loan of 10,000 pesetas, and just before the deadline 8,000 pesetas would come from Barcelona and on December 31, that is today, 2,200 guilders from Holland. So America and Holland "must" work together to help that the house is not sold out from under us! Praise the Lord, my soul, and forget not what good he has done thee!" F. B.

Literature.

Popular Commentary of the Bible. The Old Testament, Vol. II. The Poetical and the Prophetical Books. By *Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., D. D.* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. $5.00.

With this magnificent volume, a great undertaking of Concordia Publishing House comes to a close. We rejoice with the author and publisher that God has granted them grace and strength to succeed. May he now also grant zeal and fortune to the right study of the same! In all of English literature there has not been a single commentary on the entire Holy Scripture that Lutherans have been able to recommend without all kinds of restrictions and reservations, especially concerning doctrine. In the Popular Commentary we now have a Bible work that can be put into the hands of everyone without any worries. Nowhere is there any attempt to smuggle human doctrines into the Scriptures and to remove the divine thoughts from them. None of this! Nothing to it! This is the old Lutheran rule by which Scripture is everywhere treated here. Here we do not resort to any exegetical arts to tell the clear Scriptures how they must be interpreted, and what they actually want to say and have to say, if they are to stand otherwise before the judgment seat of reason and science. Here it is said, "Speak, O Lord, for thy servant heareth!" Here we merely listen to hear what the Word says. It is a joy to see and hear how everywhere our young people, especially the teachers in our Sunday schools, are zealous in reading and researching the Scriptures. What anxious worries we would have to torment ourselves if only sectarian literature were available to them! In the *Popular Commentary* we have a work of which we can only rejoice to see it in the hands of our youthful "twentieth century searchers of the Scriptures." Here they will find what they need. And here also will be recorded the greatest blessing of the book, of which all the signs are already present. But though, according to plan, the *Popular Commentary,* as its title implies, does not employ the learned, scholarly method of explaining the Scriptures, it will serve pastors and teachers of our parochial schools well. We congratulate the author and the publisher as well as the Committee on English Religious Literature (Gräbner, Buchheimer, Wilk, Dörffler, Fritz), which initiated this enterprise.

F. B.

Home Department Questions on Primary Leaflets, 1924. lessons 9-16. concordia publishing house, st. louis, mo. Eight questionnaires. 5 cts.

We would like to draw attention to this help once again. It is intended to serve children who, for physical reasons, cannot attend Sunday School. Based on the ***Primary Leaflets,*** they should fill out the above sheets of eight questions each at home and then send them to the Sunday School. This way will in any case reach children who otherwise cannot be approached. It meets the requirement that a good method must be adapted to the matter at hand as well as to the persons, circumstances, and conditions. We desire, therefore, that this plan of our Sunday School Board be tried. There should be much more blessing in it than the first impression would lead us to expect. After all, everything that serves the Saviour and His kingdom in some way is important and great, even if it is the very least. F. B.

The Lord's Prayer. By *William Dallmann.* Second edition. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. $1.50.

These" clear, popular and gripping sermons on the Lord's Prayer, first published in 1907, deserve to be reprinted. They will serve our pastors well for a long time to come. They are also very well suited for edification in the home. We wish them the widest distribution. F. B.

Bible Edition" and Bible Studies.

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments (and the Apocrypha). Translated out of the original tongues and with the former translations diligently revised by His Majesty's special command. Oxford University Press, American Branch. New York. 1276 and 232 pages 4X6, bound in morocco leather with gilt title and gilt edges. Price: -3.VV.

The New Testament. A new translation by *James Moffatt, D. D., D. Litt., M. A.* (Oxon.). Together with the Authorized Version. Parallel edition, with introduction. George H. Doran Co, New York, N. Y. 633 pages 5X7^L, bound in cloth with gilt title. Price: H2.5V.

A Translation of Luke's Gospel. With grammatical notes. By *A. T. Robertson,* M. A., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D. George H. Doran Co, New York, N.Y. 242 pages 5X7^, bound in cloth with gilt title. Price: $2.50. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Syllabus for New Testament Study. By *A. T. Robertson, M. A., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D.* George H. Doran Co, New York, N. Y. 274 pages 5X7^, bound in cloth with gilt title. Price: $2.00. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The Minister and His Greek New Testament. By *Prof. A. T. Robertson,* M. A., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D. George H. Doran Co, New York, N.Y. 139 pages 5Z^X8, bound in cloth with gilt title. Price: H1.75. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The Psalms as Liturgies. Being the Paddock Lectures for 1920. By John P. Peters, Ph. D., Sc. D., D. D. 494 pages 6x9, bound in cloth with gilt title. The Macmillan Co, New York, N.Y.. Price: ^4.00.

The Origin of Paul's Religion. The James Sprunt Lectures, delivered at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. By *J. Gresham Machen,* D. D. The Macmillan Co, New York, N. Y. 329 pages 6X9, bound in cloth with gilt title. Price, $1.75.

We are once again combining in a coherent review a number of works, some of which we received for review some time ago. The works, as the reader will soon notice, are very different and varied; but the bond that unites them is that they refer to the Bible in one way or another, without being directly exegetical works.

1. Often people ask for an English Bible edition with Apocrypha. In the usual English Bible editions they are missing without exception. There is a good reason for this. It is a consequence of the position of the Reformed Church towards the Apocrypha. In the past the Apocrypha were mostly found in the English Bible. Apocryphal controversies, however, have brought about that their removal from the editions of the Bible has been stormily demanded and also for the most part carried out. Since 1826 the English and Scottish Bible Societies have no longer distributed Bibles with apocrypha. The same is the rule of the American Bible Society. There is nothing to be said against this, after all. The word of man - and the Apocrypha are nothing but the word of man, and not even the best word of man - does not belong in a book which is called "The Bible, or the whole Holy Scripture, containing the Old and New Testaments" or "The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments". And yet the theologian often finds himself in the position of wishing to read, or at least to look up, one or other of the apocrypha in English. The above-mentioned Oxford Bible edition with the Apocrypha is the most handy one we have come across. The fact that English Bible editions with Apocrypha are now appearing again has, of course, its own special reason. It is due to the propaganda of the Episcopal Church, especially of the Romanizing tendency within it. Already for a number of years there has been an "International Society of the Apocrypha" (I. S. A.), which agitates for it. The Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in America, Tuttle of St. Louis, who died last year, recommended this Society with these words: "I am heartily in sympathy with the excellent and worthy effort being made by the I. S. A. to

make the world better acquainted with the real treasures that lie hidden in the Apocrypha." A special journal also appears in the interest of this movement, ***The International Journal of Apocrypha, in*** which not long ago one of the wardens of the Society, the Freemason English theologian W. O. E. Oesterley, wrote: "The First Book of Maccabees and the so-called Wisdom of Solomon have a much better claim to a place in the Old Testament than have Esther and the Song of Songs." Oesterley has therefore also written a comprehensive work under the title, ***"The Books of the Apocrypha.*** Their Origin, Teaching, and Contents." And even the well-known and in some respects meritorious London Society for Promoting Christian Knowlege (S. P. C. K.) has printed an edition of the Bible with Apocrypha, which it distributes with the advertisement, "Why use an incomplete Bible?" The whole movement runs out the

The modern theology is so fond of blurring the distinction between canonical and apocryphal. But while the Roman Church blurs this distinction in favor of the Apocrypha, modern theology does so to the detriment of the canonical writings. - By the way, special editions of the Apocrypha are also available from Oxford University Press at various prices, ranging from 95 cents to $2.50.

2. New translations of the New Testament into English are almost the order of the day. The latest translation by the well-known professor at Chicago University Edgar J. Goodspeed bears the special remark on the title page

American Translation," has even been advertised by the daily press, and in a few months has attained such celebrity that it has been written to us from Chicago, "The book has attracted world-wide attention." In Boston appeared a translation by W. G. Ballantine, ***The Riverside New Testament;*** in England two new translations have been published in recent years, by Weymouth and by Moffatt. Underlying all of them is an effort to modernize the Bible in language. A brief example may illustrate this. In a passage not otherwise significant, Gal. 5:7, the Authorized Version has translated, "Ye did run well"; the Revised Version almost likewise, "Ye were running well," both the exact translation of the Greek ἐτρέχετε καλώς; but Ballantine translates, "You were running finely"; Goodspeed, "You were making such progress!" and Moffatt even, "You were doing splendidly." That all three have retranslated the Holy Lord's Prayer, and in an awkward and partly erroneous manner, will not be easily forgiven them. We do not say that the Authorized Version has everywhere got it right and could not be improved, any more than anyone will say that Luther's translation has always got the exact sense of the basic text. It is therefore quite possible to read another translation for comparison, just as the excellent interpreter of the Scriptures, J. A. Bengel, in the Lutheran Church, translated the New Testament anew and put it into print, but quite modestly remarked in the preface: "I do not desire to give a better, but another (translation)." But this we say, that men are yet to be born who, taken all in all, will really give a better translation of the English as well as the German Bible than we have. The history and success, or rather non-success, of the many a Bible translation in the German as well as in the English language is instructive in more ways than one. But this is not all we have to remark upon. It is well enough known that modern translations are only too much in the service of modern theology. Among the English translations mentioned, that of Mossatt seems to us by far the most important, just as Mossatt is considered the most eminent English New Testament exegete of the present day. He has been for years professor of the New Testament at Glasgow, the author of the best-known New Testament introduction ***(Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament),*** and since this year the editor of the Expositor, the most distinguished English theological journal. But he is a modern theologian through and through, and has not been afraid to do an exegetical violence in this translation that is unparalleled. In a Bible edition, which after all is also intended for the people, he translates Matth. 1, 16 thus: "Jacob, the father of Joseph (to whom the Virgin Mary was betrothed), the father of Jesus, who is called 'Christ.'" Joseph the father of JEsu! And this Mossatt dares to offer to the Christian world, though not a single Greek manuscript gives such a reading, but only that from

(Cf. L. and W. 60, 359.) It is only good that in the present edition the old English text is right next to it and that everyone immediately notices this colossal forgery. (Cf. L. u. W. 60, 359.) It is only good that in the edition before us the old English text stands right next to it, and that everyone can immediately notice this colossal forgery. The edition is otherwise handy and beautiful.

3. 4. 5. A prominent figure in the theological life of our country is the well-known professor of New Testament at the great Baptist seminary at Louisville, Ky. He has taught there since 1888, and in these thirty-six years has had more than 5000 pastors in class, besides nearly 1000 women students, missionaries, and others. He is at the same time a very prolific writer and a gladly heard lecturer in vacation schools and from Bible conferences. And his main field of work is the linguistic study of the Greek New Testament. His ***Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament*** has also been translated into Italian, French, German, and Dutch, and his ***Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*** is the most comprehensive work in this field in any language, a volume of 1540 pages. When his sixtieth birthday was celebrated last November, scholars from various parts of the world sent him congratulations, German, French, Italian, Dutch, Greek, and of course, above all, English. Prof. A. Deissmann of Berlin, himself an authority on the subject, wrote: "The New Testament Grammar of Pros. A. T. Robertson, though a great book ***(μέγα βιβλίον),*** is a great good ***(μέγα ἀγαμόν).*** Created with Benedictine diligence, faithful in the small and reliable in the large, it will be a treasury of instruction for many years to come. I wish the deserving subject-general a richly blessed autumn of life." And Prof. F. W. Grosheide of the Free University of Amsterdam remarked, "It is Prof. A. T. Robertson who has proved in our time the truth of the old adage of Melanehthon: Omnis bonus theologus et fidelis interpres doctrinae coelestis necessarie esse debet primum grammaticus, deinde dialecticus, denique testis.'" (Every good theologian and faithful interpreter of heavenly doctrine must necessarily be first a grammarian, then a dialectician, and finally a witness). It may well be said that no one in the Reformed church communities of our country has done more by word and writing for the study of the Greek New Testament than Robertson. It should not be forgotten that his works are often written for those who do not yet have a thorough grammatical training in the language. But he always connects with them messages which are valuable even to the one being taught. The first of the books mentioned refers to the Gospel of Luke, to which Robertson has devoted special attention. He remarks in the preface: "I have had many requests to translate the New Testament, but I have always declined. The simple truth is that the Greek appeals to me more powerfully than any translation." Quite true with respect to every book of the New Testament, doubly true with respect to the linguistically so uniquely beautiful Third Gospel. Robertson now endeavours in this translation (pp. 13-136) to render as nearly as possible the shades of the Greek idiom which he uses, and then adds (pp. 139-242) "Grammatical Notes" for each verse, showing the reader the grammatical subtleties. Admittedly he does not always get it right, and even has curious curiosa, as, for instance, when he translates Luk 10:42 ("But one thing is not"), "But there is actual need of just one dish" (p. 68), and remarks in the "Notes," "The one thing needful here is not salvation, but one dish in the meal." (p. 189.) The second work is, as the subtitle says, "A Guide for Lessons in the Classroom," and grew out of his own lectures and exercises; it is full of schemes with almost endless references. There I must frankly confess: Less, much less, would have been more. I would like to see the student, indeed the professor, who can even come close to mastering this literature! All the more valuable, on the other hand, is the third work, which consists of twelve treatises, some of which have already appeared in theological journals, but all of which are pointed out to make the Greek Testament dear and valuable to the preacher, the pastor, so that it accompanies him throughout life. We have read through the whole book with interest almost in one go, and recommend it highly. The

Chapters "The Minister's Use of His Greek Testament," "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ" (an exact defense of the reasoning always followed by Lutheran exegetes and dogmatists), "Grammar and Preaching," "Sermons in Greek Tenses" - to pick out only these - will be read with pleasure and profit, and will show how the study of the Greek text directly benefits preaching. And the chapter "John Brown of Haddington, or Learning Greek without a Teacher" may serve to encourage many a pastor in whom Greek has become rather rusty. It is a pity that the books find somewhat luxuriously printed and consequently somewhat expensive. Incidentally, among many interesting details, Robertson shares this one: "Prof. William Lyons Phelps of Yale" (one of the first teachers of English language and literature in our country) "will have nothing to do with recent translations because of the literary charm of the Authorized Version." (S. 18.)

6. The work of Peters is quite differently directed. From a series of lectures it has been expanded into a book. The author was formerly rector of an Episcopal church in New York, and latterly theological professor at the University of the South. He was also known as an archaeologist. In his direction he was quite a follower of modern higher criticism, and this, of course, is constantly expressed in this work. After a lengthy introduction, in which he treats the isagogical questions of the Psalter entirely in the spirit of the newer criticism, the individual Psalms are gone through in order, and, as the title indicates, as liturgies intended for the sacrificial services in the Jewish Temple. Each psalm is presented in double translation, according to the Authorized Version and in the author's own translation. Then follows a brief explanation, again quite in keeping with modern theology. Only those who want to orientate themselves quickly and conveniently about the modern understanding of the Psalter will find what they are looking for in this book. Very correctly the author remarks on the mighty 90th Psalm: "This is so beautiful a hymn in the English, and more especially in the Prayerbook version, that it seems a pity to spoil it by a literal translation." (P. 361.) This should be remembered by some of our modern Bible translators! It should be acknowledged that Peters, in contrast to many modern critics, is quite decidedly opposed to Maccabean psalms. And in his latest work, ***Bible and Spade,*** he came to a conservative view with respect to a New Testament scripture. He there frankly confesses, "Against my former prejudice I have been compelled, especially by my last journey to the Holy Land, to realize from this eye-witness testimony, as it were, that St. John's gospel was really written by an eye-witness, the beloved apostle." (P. 236.) Yes, the preconceived critical opinions cannot stand against the clear testimony of Scripture, and against the "crying of the stones."

7. A rather pleasing and capable achievement is Machen's work on the origin of the religion of St. Paul. The author is professor of the New Testament in the Presbyterian Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and upholds the best traditions of that institution. Like the earlier Princeton teachers: the two Hodge, W. H. Green, B. B. Warfield, and like his present colleagues: C. W. Hodge, O. T. Allis, R. D. Wilson, J. D. Davis, he stands firmly, apart from his Reformed doctrinal standpoint, for the truth, divinity, and inerrancy of the Scriptures. And in this work he now treats of one of the most prevalent and dangerous errors of contemporary theology, the religious-historical view and explanation of Christianity, as held not only in Europe, but in this country, by the theologians in the most renowned universities, Chicago, Pale, Harvard, and elsewhere. Against this view, which fairly does away with the unique character of Christianity, and sets it down as a syncretistic religion with much in common with and analogous to pagan religions, Machen defends with able scholarship, great erudition, and eminent acumen the supernatural origin of Christianity. The work is a rare phenomenon on the theological book market, just like his later writing, which is only now entering the battle of the minds: ***Christianity and Liberalism***. Who wants to look around in this field - and in the coming years, if all signs do not deceive, the religious-historical conception of Christianity will be much talked about - for whom Machen's writing will be a good reading.

L. F.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From Synod. The Synod of Delegates assembled last year at Fort Wayne, Ind. made a proposition to the congregations to raise the sum of §3,850,000 for the higher institutions of learning of the Synod. The congregations responded to the proposal with great willingness. The committee appointed to direct the collection was able to report that the sum proposed by the Synod had been exceeded by nearly a million dollars. At the beginning of this month §4,781,889. 10 had been deposited partly in cash, partly underwritten. The cash receipts since Synod amount to §1,287,999.02. The collections are not yet completed. The Directory of Synod makes it known that it will confine its expenditure on buildings to the sum proposed by Synod, that is, to §3,850,000. If a cash surplus remains in the building fund, the Synod will have to dispose of it, which, D. v., will meet in St. Louis in 1926. Probably most congregations have also responded to the proposal to give the public service on May 4 the form of a thanksgiving service on the basis of 1 Chron. 29:10-18. 29, 10-18. This passage of Scripture, however, puts into perspective how the gifts of the Christians are to be regarded for the building of the Kingdom of God, so that they have and keep the Christian character. The cited 29th chapter of the first book of Chronicles tells how David made the people of Israel willing, and the people became willing to offer abundant gifts for the building of the temple. David gave of his own goods gold and silver and then asks, "And now who is willing to fill his hand to the LORD this day?" David's example was followed by "the princes of the fathers, the princes of the tribes of Israel, the princes over thousands and over hundreds, and the princes over the king's business." All became "freemen." And the people were not left behind. It goes on to say, "And the people rejoiced that they were free: for they gave it freely to the LORD with all their heart." Then follows vv. 10-18 David's public prayer of thanksgiving, wherein is described for all time until the Last Day the right giving for the building of the Kingdom of God on earth. The words of David's prayer of thanksgiving are well worth reading over and over again. They read: "And David praised God, and said before all the congregation, Blessed art thou, O Lord God of Israel our father, for ever. To thee be majesty, and power, and glory, and victory, and thanksgiving. For all things in heaven and on earth are yours. Thine is the kingdom, and thou art exalted to be supreme over all. Thine is the riches and the glory before thee: thou art ruler over all things: in thy hand is strength and might: in thy hand is it to make every man great and strong. Now, our God, we thank thee, and praise the name of thy glory. For what am I? What am my people, that we should be able to give strength freely, as this is done? For from thee did all this come, and from thy hand have we given it thee. For we are strangers and sojourners before thee, as were all our fathers. Our life upon earth is as a shadow, and there is no endurance. O LORD our God, all this company which we have sent to build a house unto thee, even unto thy holy name, is from thy hand.

...and all is thine. I know, O my God, that thou searchest the heart, and sincerity is acceptable unto thee. Therefore I have freely given all these things out of a sincere heart; and now I have seen with joy thy people which are here, that they have freely given unto thee. O LORD God of our fathers, of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, keep such a mind and thought in the hearts of thy people forever, and send their hearts unto thee!" In this prayer of thanksgiving two main ideas come out: 1. All that we possess of earthly goods is God's beforehand, namely, a gift of His divine grace and goodness. (2) But a gift of God's grace is also the right attitude, according to which we voluntarily place our earthly goods at the service of Him who gave them. This is not done by our own reason or strength, but it is an effect of the Holy Spirit's grace that we do not want to earn heaven in whole or in part with our gifts, but offer our gifts to God as a sacrifice of thanksgiving for the divine mercy shown to us in Christ, so that through faith in Christ we already possess heaven and blessedness. But with all the relatively large collections and institutions, let us not forget that these things belong only to the outward apparatus of the building of the Christian church. Larger collections and larger institutional buildings are of value to the Christian Church only in so far as they serve the teaching and learning of the pure Gospel. - In a necrology of Blessed Father August Gübert ("Lutherans," p. 192) we find the remark: "It may be emphasized that the deceased, in his congregations, because they could not make it possible to employ an assistant in the school office, undertook the school teaching himself for twenty-nine years without interruption." We have known several pastors of our synod who, throughout their lives, even into their old age, have held the school office in addition to the preaching ministry, and these were pastors who had a complete university education. That is faithful service to the temple of God, to the Christian church! And that faithfulness, thank God, has not yet died out among us. We read in the "Nebraska District Messenger," "Many pastors do not shrink from the arduous work of holding school five days a week, besides their responsible and duty-bound preaching ministry. Sometimes they may groan under the burden of work and feel it painful that they cannot meet all the demands. But undaunted they continue to work and sacrifice themselves in the service of their Lord. May God be the rich recompense of these men willing to sacrifice, who take care of the whole flock in such an unselfish way!" This is followed in the same sheet by a double reminder to the congregations: 1. not to be satisfied with a Sunday school, 2. to see to it and make it possible that all the children of the congregation attend the established parochial schools. The school report of the district closes with the words: "If we all work in the right spirit under the fervent invocation of God for the precious jewel, our parochial school, then God will assist us with his help, and all our enemies will be put to shame in spite of their efforts to put an end to our parochial school." The enemies of our parochial schools, however, are not resting. The battle in the state of Michigan will have to be taken up anew.

Just tvir read in the journal of the "Western Post" here, in a dispatch, dated May 8: "The state supreme court of Michigan granted James Hamilton of Detroit a writ of mandamus Thursday authorizing the latter to compel the secretary of state to place on the ballot at the November election a bill called the antiparochial school amendment. This amendment requires that all school-age children shall be compelled to attend the public schools." Probably in most of the States of the Union there is a strong party resolved to defy the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. On the other hand, we may also report that quite recently high state officials have again publicly warned, yes, not to tamper with parental rights in regard to the education of their children. Thus the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, John J. Blaine, has recently spoken out. We read in the Journal deS "MilWaukee-Herold": " 'The State can never and should never take over those duties and rights which the parents have in the home,' declared Governor John J. Blaine in an address to the members of the Milwaukee Women's Club at the Pfister Hotel. The governor condemned the .benevolent bureaucratism' which has lately been making inroads and which seeks to substitute state authority and legislation for the responsibilities of parents in the home. 'Parents alone have the absolute right to determine the religion in which their children shall be educated, the language in which they shall communicate with them, and the school which they shall attend; against injustice and abortion in these rights, the State has to protect the family, the home, as is laid down in our Constitution,' declared the governor, 'for the foundation of goodly and national government is the family and the home; once these are violated and destroyed, the government is in a bad way. Without the home there is no society, no unity, and no humanity, and therefore the first duty of government should be to protect the home, to uphold and vouch for the sacred rights given to the family in the Constitution. Let us face the facts and not close our minds to the realization that a tendency has lately been trying to spread which abridges the rights of the family, which seeks to transfer to the state a part of that responsibility which the family alone possesses. Spies, supervisors and policemen are to be put in the place of parents, and if this tendency spreads, our government will find itself in stormy waters. The nationalization of children means the beginning of the decline of government.' " How vigorously our present President Coolidge, when he was Vice-President, spoke out to the same effect, we have before reported. F. P.

On the state of things in the "American" Episcopal Church. In place of the late Bishop Tuttle (who was also Primate of the American Episcopalians), Frederick F. Johnson has become Bishop of Missouri. Johnson has spoken to the effect that he personally accepts the creed of the Episcopal Church, but does not deny church fellowship to anyone who disagrees. Literally, according to a newspaper report, Johnson said, "I personally accept what is written in the Creed. It satisfies my affections. It appeals to my heart And as has been well

said, if we cannot prove what is called miraculous, neither can we disprove it. But if a man says to me that he cannot accept the Creed just as I do, I wish the Church might make a way for him to come with whatever acceptance of the Creed he can give without doing violence to that mentor which he, like Socrates, carries in his breast." F. P.

Renewed wooing of Rome by American Episcopalians. The Associated Press reports from Philadelphia under May 1: "In the Convention of priests of the Protestant Episcopal Church held here yesterday, the reunion of the Anglican with the Roman Catholic Church, from which it has been separated since the days of Henry VIII, was advocated. Dr. Stewart, rector of St. Luke's Church, Evanston, III, said that the continuance of the schism was "a scandal and a sin."

F. P.

Baptists and Presbyterians complain of religious oppression in Romania. The Associated Press reports on May 17: "A resolution has been presented to the Convention of the Southern Baptist Church by the President of Furman University, Greenville, S. C., requesting the Convention to communicate directly with the Romanian Government and urge it to guarantee full religious liberty to Baptists residing in Romania. The resolution states that complaints have been received from Baptists of various nationalities living in Romania, who report that "because of their religion they are subjected to personal insults and acts of violence, publicly ridiculed, brought before the courts on the most trivial of pretexts, and fines and imprisonment imposed on them". Some, moreover, have been maltreated by the policemen and gendarmes and beaten to unconsciousness." It is further reported that the children of Baptists are set back in the Romanian schools and often expelled merely because of their faith, that in certain districts Baptists are refused marriage licenses, that Baptists are permitted to hold services only in certain public buildings, and that the government permits only Romanian citizens to administer the preaching ministry. Also, according to the complainants, Bibles are burned by the Romanians, foreign preachers are thrown into prison, and the Bapttsten churches are forbidden to accept foreign aid. Finally, even the burial of Baptists in the common churchyards is said to be forbidden. - The General Assembly of the Church of the Presbyterians of the United States received a petition presented by the Rev. S. L. Morris of Atlanta, Ga. and Dunbar H. Ogden of Mobile, Ala. for the aid of the 'suffering minorities' among the Protestants of Central and Southern Europe. The petition states that the condition of Protestants residing in territories assigned to new states after the war is a lamentable one, both politically and physically. In the partition of Hungary alone, 780,000 members of the Presbyterian Church were naturalized into Romania. These report that, whereas before they formed a cohesive unit and were able to carry out their religious duties without hindrance, they now find themselves in an environment where they form a small minority and are surrounded by spies who gain access to the church. The Presbyterians live in constant fear of political persecutors,

and the Romanian government restricts freedom of worship and even dictates to Presbyterian churches which hymns may be sung during services. The Romanians have confiscated many more church buildings, after a law was passed which, among other things, stipulates that no Protestant congregation with fewer than 300 members may own a church building." - So much for the Associated Press report. Negotiations with the Romanian government are likely to be of little avail. If the press reports were based on truth, the Polish government was also petitioned from England, Sweden, and also from the United States, that the Lutherans in Riga should not be robbed of the large Lutheran church which had been in their possession for four hundred years. The success was a negative one. It is easier to cause confusion in the world than to remove confusion.

F. P.

II. Abroad.

How thoughts of a separation of church and state are stirring in Germany, we see from a letter to "Das christliche Haus", a "Protestant family paper for parents and educators". The sender, who calls himself "Tobias," writes: "Perhaps you, too, dear friend, are among those who have been moved in recent weeks by the imminent possibility of a separation of Church and State. Perhaps you are saddened by it and think: What will happen when no more state money flows into the church coffers? Won't the church authorities have to stop their work? Where will the preaching of the Word and the church's activity of love remain? What appearance will the evangelical church community take on? Tobias has heard many people say that they have no hope for a happy solution, for the continued existence of our Protestant Church. The Catholic Church, it is clear to all, will grow. Her international relations with the valuta-strong foreign countries, which are regulated in Rome and have been especially zealously cultivated of late, guarantee her an unshakable existence. And we? Well, for the present, separation is not yet a fact. For the time being the State, though it has declared itself religiously neutral, is still inclined, for good reasons, not altogether to abandon the Church as a factor in the maintenance of the State. A declaration has been made according to which funds will continue to be paid as long as the church makes every effort to make proper use of its own sources of aid. The rents on lands belonging to the church are to be increased in proportion to the depreciation of money, and the members of the congregation are to be called upon to pay a higher church tax. Both demands are reasonable and justified. For the church would have to make both demands of its own accord when the separation from the state was completed, and Tobias thinks that the church would then have to claim these two sources of income to a far greater extent. So for the present the separation will not yet be a fact. But if once it does? Will the church then become a prey to the wolves? Let us consider whether a blessing might not result from the separation. We must begin as the first Christians began. And that in itself would be good. Those who are church members in name only would do likewise to the deniers of God and leave; they would no longer want to pay the high church taxes. For those who remain, who

For sincere Christians, of course, this would result in an even greater burden, but they would take it upon themselves in the certainty that this burden is lighter than the cross that Christ carried. Tobias knows of others who would also leave: many pastors. What a blessing for the Church it would be if here too the wheat were separated from the chaff! The "clever" spiritual critics, the false miracle-workers and the opponents of the confession would go. And those will go who have converted their study into a bedchamber and their pastoral walks into strolling pleasure walks, and who nevertheless regard a not inconsiderable sum on the first of the quarter as well earned and in need of increase. And there will remain the saintly imbued, those called of God, who, for the sake of blessing, perform their office with the utmost fidelity on a small income. Tobias likes to picture what life must be like in such a congregation of genuine convinced Christians with such a Spirit-driven pastor! Since she wants to and must maintain her pastor, she will also have the right to choose the one who suits her. The duty to maintain goes hand in hand with the right to vote. This is what brings a congregation to the consciousness of its value: it will be recognized by its pastor. If he is driven by the Spirit, he will have joyful co-workers: the right teacher in the right denominational school, the voluntary deaconess in the care of the poor and the sick, the man who is glad to work at church festivals and other events. This will be a life from within, and no one would be able to say any longer that the Protestant Church was perishing because of its clergymen. You are shocked, dear friend, and think: if so many leave, then there will be little left! Certainly! But that is good! The many were hitherto only dragged along as ballast; they are to blame for the fact that our church has come so much into disregard. The few who are left in Israel are leaven, light, are like the city on the mountain. And do you not think that this holy remnant is more able than the unholy whole? The spirit of leaven is the best missionary spirit! A church free from state considerations has the opposite effect on the masses as the state church. From the latter there is flight, at the gates of the latter one knocks, asking for admittance, at the latter one criticizes, in the latter faith reigns, in the former sit sleeping church-goers, in the latter attentive hearers who are also at the same time doers of the word. Dear friend, we have no separation yet; but when the separation comes, be cheerful, and stand in the ranks of the new congregation with a spirit of sacrifice. " F. P.

The "A. E. L. K." reports on **the position of the German political parties on the "Protestant School"** that three parties advocate the "Protestant School". These are the "Deutsch-Völkische Freiheitspartei," the "Deutsch-nationale Volkspartei," and the "Deutsche Volkspartei." The report goes on to say about other parties: "The German Democratic Party refers to a pamphlet published by it, in which it is said: 'The spirit of the school must be that of German national education. Thus the community school appears to us as the ideal form of elementary school. The community school should draw from the moral, religious, artistic, and political spirit of German culture and unite pupils of all world views on the basis of the common German educational heritage. The needs of the

denominations, it shall correspond to them by means of curricular religious instruction in accordance with the principles of the Church as laid down in Article 159 of the Reich Constitution.' The Communist Party of Germany: 'In order to help prepare such a national community, the K. P. D. in its school policy resolutely advocates the secular school for all children of the German people. . . . However, parents should be free to have their children receive private religious instruction outside the uniform secular school. Thus the parental rights of Protestant parents are also fully respected by the school program of the Catholic-Polish Democratic Party. The united Social Democratic Party of Germany has not yet answered the questions posed. One will not be able to avoid drawing conclusions from this silence." - We perceive here some analogies to the state of affairs with us in the United States. The "German Democratic Party" wants the "common school" on the basis of the "German educational good," but in such a way that "the needs of the denominations" will be met by "curricular" religious instruction. This corresponds roughly to the wishes of American sects and also of some Lutherans who want no community schools but only the state school, but who insist that in the curriculum of the state school a certain hour or even certain hours be set aside for the religious instruction of the various religious communities. The "Communist Party of Germany" also wants to permit religious instruction. Only no time is to be given for this instruction on the curriculum of the "uniform secular school." Especially in Saxony the same foolishness has taken place that we have had to fight in some of our States and will have to fight again in Michigan. Parochial schools are to be - in contradiction with the Imperial Constitution - entirely forbidden. This is how we understand an announcement in the "Ev.-Luth. Freikirche" of March 30, where it says: "The regional assembly of the Ev.-Luth. Freikirche in Saxony, which met on February 24 of this year in the Ev.-Luth. St. Johanniskirche at Planitz in Saxony, unanimously takes exception to the school law provisions in Saxony, according to which Christian parochial schools - contrary to the provisions of the Reich Constitution, Art. 146, Para. 2 - cannot continue to exist or be newly founded. It asks the Reich School Protection Office to shape the Reich School Law in such a way that it will be impossible for the legislative bodies in Saxony to perpetuate §§ 4, 6 and 3, Para. 12, of the Transitional Law for the Elementary School System of July 22, 1919. The "Evangelical Lutheran Free Church in Saxony" is a public corporation and fully claims the rights enshrined in Articles 146 and 147 of the Reich Constitution and protests against the breaking of Reich law by state law. It places its confidence in the Reich School Board that, standing firmly on the ground of the Constitution, it will also be concerned with the implementation of the same by way of law." F. P.

Baptists in Lutheran countries. We read: "The Baptists are spreading rapidly and purposefully in Lutheran Europe, especially in the Scandinavian countries. Sweden now has 681 Baptist congregations with 436 preachers and missionaries, Denmark counts 32 congregations with 32 preachers, Norway 42 congregations with 30 preachers, and Finland 45 congregations and 84 preachers." There will be nothing left but that

Lutherans should remember their Lutheran faith... This is based in all parts on God's Word, and with God's Word one is well armed and protected against all errors. This is also true for Germany and for all countries where Lutherans are found. Of course, this reminder is truly not superfluous for us American Lutherans either. It is all, as Luther says, in our ceaseless "driving and rubbing" of the "Word." F. P.

Why is it "Catholic time" now? From almost all "Protestant" countries, even from the "Lutheran" countries, there are reports about an energetic advance of Rome. Such reports are available from Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, England and also from our own country. Specifically about Germany, the "A. E. L. K." states, among other things: "It's catholic time now." "There are so many of them running about, even in Protestant theological circles, whose windows are open to St. Pietro. Why should not this or that reader of our church paper be among them?" "One notices it in the attitude of the governments, one feels it in our literature (for what is not Jewish is for the most part Catholic, or at least Catholicized). You notice it everywhere, quite apart, of course, from everything that Rome herself does." The "A. E. L. K." has not yet completed its investigation of why it is "Catholic time." And we fear, on the basis of previous experience, that it will not come to a clear exposition of the "why." Should it happen, we will report it with great joy and thanksgiving to God. He who knows the ecclesiastical situation in the "Protestant," or rather "Lutheran" countries, and has eyes to see and ears to hear, that is, by God's grace has Christian understanding of the nature of Christianity, knows very well why it is now "Catholic" time in "Protestant" countries. In these countries most of the theologian world, and consequently most of the pastor world, and much of the lay world, has fallen away from the Gospel and from the Scriptures as God's Word. One has fallen away from the Gospel, from the "sola gratia," because one denies the satisfactio Christi vicaria. One has fallen away from the "sola Scriptura" because one denies the Scriptures as God's own infallible Word. In other words, in the midst of "Protestant" countries it has again become "Catholic time" because one despises the divine act of the Reformation, through which the "sola Dei gratia" and the "sola Scriptura", destined for the whole Church, were again so powerfully placed on the lampstand. One has made oneself defenceless against Rome. We have an "analogue" for this in the political field. Germany allowed herself to be talked out of her arms, and thereupon her political opponents entered Germany victoriously. In "Protestant" or "Lutheran" countries, modern theology has allowed Scripture to be taken from them as God's Word and vicarious satisfaction, and that is why Rome is now advancing victoriously there. This is exactly the ecclesiastical situation. Rome is ecclesiastically utterly powerless where the gospel of Christ's vicarious satisfaction and the "It is written" are held up to her in earnest. Rome, on the other hand, is supreme wherever it lacks the testimony of these divine truths to which victory is promised. F. P.

Complaints about the "contempt for Protestant marriage" on the part of the Pope's Church crop up again and again in Germany. Such complaints are evil. They give the impression that "we Protestants" are interested in being recognized by the Pope's Church. If a "contempt of evangelical marriage" comes into the public eye, the truly "evangelicals" should use the opportunity to state clearly that the papal sect despises not only the "evangelical marriage," but the whole Gospel, and despises it to such an extent that in the Tridentinum it puts a curse on all who teach and believe the Gospel. To this exposition might then be attached the admonition of Scripture, "Depart from her, my people, that ye receive not any of her plagues: for her sins reach unto heaven, and God remembereth her iniquities." F. P.

About the Roman propaganda in Sweden the chairman of the Swedish Pastors' Association reports the following: "The Roman propaganda has taken on quite aggressive forms. After the visit of Cardinal van Rossum and the Jesuit Prof. J. Mausbach, whose journeys here in Sweden have been described by the press of the papist world in quite exaggeratedly strong colours as a kind of triumphal procession, while in reality their significance has not been great, Roman propaganda has at least raised its head much more boldly than before. In spite of the fact that in Sweden monastic foundations and religious abbeys are forbidden, a masked nunnery has been established near Stockholm. A young Roman priest, a Swedish convert, has delivered a much-noticed propaganda lecture before the student body at Lund, with the assistance of a priest from Copenhagen, and the press has taken a close interest in the matter, generally sharply hostile; only a single liberal paper has taken a pro-Catholic position. On the other hand, measures have been taken to oppose this new advance of Rome. Various speakers, among them a well-known Social Democratic deputy, a layman, have given lectures against Rome in various places. The bishops of the Swedish Church have issued a much-heeded, awakening exhortation, and the General Swedish Pastors' Association is following the further course of developments through special commissioners. Real gain by the conversion of persons to the Papal Church has not been recorded by Rome in Sweden, and the current of thought 'back to the Church of the Fathers,' to which reference is made from the Roman side, has little actual behind it." - So far the Swedish reporter. But it is not to be forgotten that in the night all cats are gray. And spiritual night, in which one can no longer distinguish between the Christian doctrine of grace and the heathen doctrine of works of Rome, is everywhere where the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, and thus the Christian doctrine of justification by faith without works of the law, is forgotten. There one already stands inwardly with Rome on the same pagan basis of the works doctrine, and the ability to distinguish between Christian teachers and wolves in Roman sheep's clothing is lost. Now, however, the Lutheran Church of Sweden has an archbishop who has again recently expressed himself to this effect: "All dogmas must fall as husks." Among these dogmas the Archbishop reckoned and reckons chiefly also the satisfactio vicaria and the inspiration of Holy Scripture. Bishops and Professors Share the Position

of the archbishop. If the ministry and the laity had not also been liberalized to a large extent, Söderblom would have been impossible as archbishop from the outset. If the Swedish Church does not want to be doctrinally defenseless against Rome, it must return to Lutheran doctrine. However, we also believe that the Roman propaganda in Sweden will not have much outward success at first. The Swedish national feeling is still too strong for that. Also, Sweden does not yet have the confused social and political conditions which Rome knows how to use in other countries to gain ground.

F. P.

The walk to Kant's grave to commemorate the bicentenary of Kant's birth. (Kant born April 22, 1724.) In a political paper we find the following dispatch, dated Berlin, April 23: "In Königsberg on Monday the new tomb for Immanuel Kant was dedicated. An impressive ceremony took place in the cathedral on this occasion, attended by representatives of the whole German and foreign world, who had assembled in the East Prussian capital. The addresses were delivered by Prof. von Harnack and Prof. Stettiner. The participants then proceeded to the grave in the cathedral cemetery. The procession resembled a pilgrimage paying its last respects to one of the world's great men. The inauguration speech was held by the mayor of Königsberg, Lohmeyer. Among the innumerable participants were no less than two hundred representatives of the academic world of Europe, America, and East Asia, apart from the German Kant admirers. Among the guests were seen Prof. Edward Schaub of Northwestern University at Evanston, III, and Jacob R. Marcus of the University at Cincinnati, O." In the foregoing report the colors are probably somewhat heavily applied. "Innumerable" will hardly have been the participants. Most certainly, however, the assertion that the "two hundred representatives" mentioned were in reality representatives "of the academic world of Europe, America, and East Asia" does not correspond to the facts. After all, there is a Kant-worship which may be called, in a limited sense, a "world-wide" one. And this is to be regretted from both a scientific and a Christian point of view. Kant would undoubtedly be a sharp mind. In a certain sense one can accept it when Kant has been called an "educator to strict, methodical thinking". At the same time, however, Kant is a type of philosophers and theologians who, out of conscious or unconscious enmity against the Christian religion and for the purpose of combating it, emancipate themselves from all logic and become persistent representatives of illogic. This has been said of Kant's writing "Religion within the Limits of Mere Reason" (1793) by Ernst Sartorius in a refutation, entitled: "Religion outside the limits of mere reason" (1822), clearly demonstrated. Sartorius thus exposes the self-contradiction in which Kant moves: On the one hand, Kant assumes in man the "radical" evil which corrupts all maxims of life, which cannot be eradicated even by human powers, and that it therefore transcends all human concepts, as it is possible for a naturally evil man to make himself a good man. On the other hand, Kant bases his doctrine of duties on the "Thou shalt." Sartorius says: "Thou shalt, therefore thou canst, this is the so famous as false sophism, by which now for over an age the heralds of the

The fact is that the religious leaders of the Church, the religious leaders of the religion of reason, together with their after-heroes and the entire body of scholars, believe they can throw the foundations of the ecclesiastical doctrinal concept over the heap with a single blow; but this thrust against logic is really too crude that it should not at last find a serious rebuke. Is it not a nasty trick to impress the inexperienced with such categorical and laconic words? Thou shalt, therefore thou canst, and now secretly to supplement: entirely without grace, by mere free will, although this, by one's own admission, contains something incomprehensible and contradictory? So harshly do those who call themselves preferably rational sin against the rational laws of logic." In special application to Kant, Sartorius says: "As utterly, unchristianly, and foolishly let us reject the proposition with which the first piece of Kant's Religion within the Limits of Mere Reason concludes, viz. the following: 'It is not essential and therefore not necessary for everyone to know what God does or has done for his blessedness, but well what he himself [man] has to do in order to become worthy of this assistance.'" In ever new connections Sartorius lays out both the illogic of Kant and his rationalist unbelievers and their rejection of the Christian doctrine of grace. He writes: "This is the human infirmity of practical philosophy and of theology formed after it, that it cannot step out of the conditions of the causal connection [according to which God's gracious disposition is caused by human virtue], but always allows divine benevolence to be conditioned by our benevolence, but for this very reason must presuppose it or even, inexplicably and contradictorily enough, allow it to arise from evil. . . . The grace of God does not presuppose it [human good conduct]; for it forgives the debtor's debt in vain, it meets the prodigal son with lavish love, it declares us justified even before we are justified by works, it gives us the satisfaction of Christ, which we do not deserve, and now-whoever is thus loved beforehand by God in Christ-should he not love again his most high, most gracious Beneficent? . . . From time immemorial the philosophical schools have argued with one another as to the relation in which blessedness is to be placed to morality; but they always agree, except the Christian, in regarding it only as the consequence of morality. Christianity, on the other hand, reverses the relation, and in touching promises first gives the love of God and the certainty of blessedness, thereby satisfies, calms, and soothes the heart, and then brings forth morality from the grateful, love-filled heart, so that morality is thus to be regarded as a consequence of certain blessedness, and not the reverse. . . . At last, at the end, the book [Kant's] circulates back into itself again, by repeating once more the πρώτον *γενδος*, "namely, that it is not the right way (according to the Christian way) to proceed from pardon to virtue, but rather from virtue to pardon,' and thus, then, for the substantiation of genuine virtue and religion in this whole doctrine of religion, within the limits of mere reason, purely nothing is said, but enough is said for the de-foundation of the same. Yes, this is philosophy, like that of which Paul writes Col. 2:8: "Take heed that no man rob you through philosophy and loose seduction, after the doctrine of men, after the doctrine of men.

the statutes of the world, and not after Christ!" Christ alone is the way, the truth, and the life, and not these rationalists, whose wisdom is folly in the sight of God, and not in the sight of God alone, but also in the sight of every mind not caught up in their vanity. For a single impartially penetrating glance suffices to recognize in all its nakedness that which is unscientific, illogical, circular, contradictory to the laws of an understanding reason." Sartorius is aware that he uses harsh words in his writing against Kant's "religion within the limits of mere reason." He does not, however, ask apology, but rather says (Introductory, p. XVI), "If any one should find the language of this writing too harsh, let him know that it still seems to me far too weak." As is well known, Luther also needs harsh words in the same matter. It is, after all, an old disease to conclude from "ought" to "can." Erasmus also concluded thus in order to prove his facultas se applicandi ad gratiam. Luther calls this stupor quidam vel lethargia quaedam, and exclaims, "How is it that you theologians are so foolish (ineptiatis), as if you were two-faced children, that as soon as you find a word in the form of a command, you infer reality from it?" (Opp. v. a. Vll, 216. 210; St. L. XVIII, 1788 ff.) So conclude in our time the German synergists, e. g. Luthardt, comp.w, p. 269 f. So concluded also American Lutherans in the controversy about conversion and election of grace. Leander Keyser wrote as late as 1914 in *Election and Conversion*, pp. 43,44: "Note that Christ began to preach to unregenerate men by saying, 'Repent ye and believe the Gospel.' Why *command* them to do what they were utterly unable to do? . . . Why *bid* a man believe when he couldn't?" And Keyser met with many-sided approval. - In Sartorius' writing against Kant there are still some obscurities and inconsistencies. But Scripturally and dogmatically clear he determines the concept of beatific grace as God's gracious disposition (gratuitus Dei propter Christum favor). In harmony with this, he also quite correctly determines the concept of faith, inasmuch as it makes blessed. He says: "Now we also understand what it means: faith makes blessed. Impossibly this can and must be understood as if faith in and of itself were a meritorious work. . . . Faith in the gospel does not make blessed in any other way than as faith in glad tidings makes merry," etc. God gave great grace in Germany's revival period a hundred years ago. It is a pity that it has not been generally used and recorded. F. P.

Latin as an International Language. The Associated Press reports from Rome, May 2: "The International Sociological Congress closed its sessions here today with the wish that Latin be made the basis of an international language, since it was impossible to agree on the use of any of the living languages." The wish will hardly come true. And if it were to be fulfilled, a uniform pronunciation would also have to be agreed upon. It was reported from the Council of Infallibility in 1870 that the Roman bishops, assembled from all countries, used the Latin language, but still did not understand each other for the most part, because the French pronounced the Latin in French, the English in English, and so on. F. P.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. June and July 1924. No. 6 and 7.

"With all joyfulness."

Parting words addressed to our class of candidates this year by F. Pieper.

If, in the name of the theological faculty, I am to address to you a last word of remembrance before your entry into the practical office of preaching, let it be the word: μετά *πάσης παρρησίας*, "with all joyfulness". For thus the Scriptures describe the preaching activity of the Apostle Paul, when he was in captivity at Rome. It is said in the last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, in the last verse: "Paul preached the kingdom of God, and taught of the Lord JEsu with all joyfulness." You, dear candidates, have learned by God's grace in a three-year course of theological instruction, and by God's grace have become proficient to preach the word of the LORD JEsu. Do this now also by God's grace "with all joyfulness," μετά *πάσης παρρησίας*. Do it in the place where your profession reads, and do it in all the circumstances in which your profession places you.

Scripture places great emphasis on "with joyfulness." It often refers to this. When Peter and John were brought before the high council at Jerusalem because of the preaching of Christ, they did not behave timidly and reservedly, but testified to the high assembly: "There is salvation in no other, neither is there any other name given unto men, wherein we must be saved." They did this in a way that aroused wonder. It is expressly recorded in the 4th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, "But they beheld the joyfulness (παρρησίαν) of Peter and John, and marvelled." In the same chapter we further read that the church of God at Jerusalem came before God with this intercession, "Grant unto thy servants to speak thy word with all joyfulness!" But more! When the apostles at Jerusalem had not only been cast into prison, but had also been beheaded, they neither lamented nor wept, but went away joyfully (παρρησίας) from the presence of the council, that they had been worthy to suffer reproach for JEsu's name's sake, and ceased not all the days in the temple, and

To teach and preach in the houses the gospel of Jesus Christ. This is your example and that of all preachers of the gospel:

And you have every cause to do so. It is true that sometimes in the description of the professions assigned to you it is said thus or similarly, "The place is remote," "The one called will stand quite alone." And that would like to discourage some. But you know from Scripture: Wherever your calling is, whether to a place in our own land, or to Canada, or to South America, or to Europe, or to India, or to China, you are never alone and forsaken. No less than your Saviour Himself goes with you, and is with you, and abides with you. To this end his promise is quite explicit and especially for the preachers of the gospel: "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. For, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." And the word is true as any other word of Scripture.

You also know from Scripture that you have a message to proclaim, which is the gratia *universalis*. To all with whom

In the preaching of the gospel, you bring to all without exception the grace of God purchased by Christ, namely, the forgiveness of sins, and with it heaven and salvation. For you know, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their sins unto them, and hath established among us the word of reconciliation," of the reconciliation that was made. With "all joyfulness," μετά *πόσης παρρησίας*, may you

and say, "We are therefore ambassadors in Christ's stead, for God admonishes through us. So now we ask in Christ's stead: Be reconciled to God. For God made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become in him the righteousness that is before God."

You know further from Scripture that you have a message to preach which is *sola* gratia, that is, whole grace, full grace, free grace, a grace which is not conditioned by any human worthiness or human good conduct. Thus you are fully equal to the worst cases of sinfulness that may confront you. You have a grace to proclaim that is greater than all sin. As the Scripture testifies, "But where sin became mighty, grace became much mightier."

At last, also the circumstance shall not take away your παρρησία,

that the preaching of Christ crucified is an offence to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks. It would certainly make you despondent if it were your task to prove the gospel of Christ to be true with human reason. But you know

from the Scriptures that a great demonstrator walks with you and is with you. This one has taken it upon himself to prove the Word of God preached by you to be true in the hearts and to make it strong. That is God the Holy Ghost. It is, indeed, we may say, the "business" of the Holy Spirit in the world until the Last Day, to be present everywhere in the world with His divinely convincing and converting efficacy, and to be in the Word where the Word of the Cross is preached; as, then, the Saviour expressly says of the Holy Spirit, John 16, "The same shall transfigure me." Only be faithful, by God's grace, faithful in the public and special preaching of the word that went out of God's mouth, namely, the word of the Holy Scriptures, and the word of promise will be fulfilled, "The word that goeth out of my mouth shall not return unto me void, but shall do that which is pleasing in my sight, and shall prosper when I send it."

So, my dear young brothers, go μετά *χάσης παρρησίας*.
to your life's calling. Through diligent study, through daily practice in God's Word, you will awaken, promote and maintain the "joyfulness" in yourself again and again when it wants to fade away. - And to you, the students of the second and third clauses hitherto, I lay it to your heart: return to the Institution in September with the firm resolution, wrought by the Holy Spirit, μετά *σπονδής to* continue your studies, as it is God's holy will to you, and as it befits all who prepare themselves for the highest and most important office which Christ has endowed here on earth. God be with you! Amen.

Did Luther really understand the second petition of the Lord's Prayer in the sense of Jesus?

In the theology of the present time the question of the right understanding of the kingdom of God taught by Jesus has come to the fore again. And not without good reason. The subject is important in and of itself. In his speeches and sermons the Saviour did not touch upon it only temporarily, but on the contrary placed it in the center of his proclamation of salvation. JEsu's preaching was, in essence, nothing other than the announcement of the good news of the realization of the Kingdom of God through Himself - His coming, suffering and death. What he spoke to the heart of Israel was το *ευαγγελίαν τής βασιλείας*, Matt. 24:14, the publication of the μυστήρια *τής βασιλείας των ουρανών*, Matt. 13:11, or
very briefly δ *λόγος τής βασιλείας*, Matth. 13, 19. He that believed the word of JEsu was taught unto the kingdom of heaven, μα& *ητευ& εις τή βασιλείς των ουρανών*, Matth. 13, 52. This explains the frequent use of the

Expression "kingdom of God" and its equivalents in the discourses of the HErrn. In Matthew βασιλεία *τον & εοϋ occurs* fifty times, in Mark fifteen times, in Luke thirty-eight times, and in John three times, that is, over a hundred times in the four short Gospels. It may be understood, therefore, that JEsus was chiefly known as the King of Israel, and that His examination towards the end of His life before the spiritual and temporal tribunal had for its chief object the ascertainment of His divine kingship. Cf. Matth. 26, 63. 64; 27, 11. 29. 37; Luk. 23, 37. 43 etc.

Not a little, however, was contributed by polemics to the fact that this subject was examined and illuminated anew. Ritschl's erroneous conception of the kingdom of God, which found general acceptance in a short time, was both much praised and much blamed, depending on whether one shared his opinion or rejected it. While Ritschl's comrades in spirit wanted to recognize in his view the most adequate expression of the teachings of Jesus about the Kingdom of God, positive theologians oriented to the confessions of the Lutheran Church proved the complete untenability of Ritschl's presentation in countless writings, and so the subject had to remain before the theological public.

This is still the case today. Ritschl's opinion about the kingdom of God, which is certainly quite wrong, has been able to gain acceptance not only in Germany, but also in England and America, and in our country especially among the Reformed sects. They were very much displeased that religion should be "directed to the moral organization of mankind". To their wholly Calvinistic theology no other view is so intelligible as Ritschl's, though the statements of some of their most eminent spokesmen may seem to speak against it. The rationalism of Ritschl and that of Calvin touch each other too closely to allow any essential differences to arise. That Ritschl's conception of the kingdom of God really dominates our Reformed sects completely is proven, among other things, by their world missionary program, which in some respects is truly magnificent. Sums amounting to millions are collected, and messengers are sent out by the thousands to "morally organize" not only individual peoples, but, where possible, all mankind, and thus bring about the kingdom of God. In connection with this program is a rapturous conception of the second coming of JEsu, who, in their opinion, will soon appear and in revealed glory will complete his kingdom on earth. This chiliastic hope is both the reason and the goal of the Reformed missionary movement in our country today.

The theologian will not be allowed to pass by these phenomena. If he really wants to be what his noble profession demands him to be

If he is a preacher of the gospel in the sense of Jesus, he must be careful to test the spirits of the time. This is not only his privilege, but also his sacred duty. In such an examination the Lutheran theologian will soon see why, on the part of the Reformed, one agrees so generally with the "Lutheran" Ritschl, while one understands Luther the longer the less. For as soon as one Calvinizes, so soon one rationalizes. And Ritschl has excessively let his exuberant rationalism run wild. Hence his popularity in the modern-rationalistic "Lutheran" and "Reformed" circles, who understand Luther's theology of Scripture all the less the more they themselves step out of Scripture. In fact, Luther and Ritschl are diametrically opposed poles whose doctrinal positions do not touch each other anywhere, not even in the slightest. Therefore, whoever is a Ritschlian must reject Luther's entire doctrinal position; and conversely, whoever is a confessionally faithful Lutheran cannot find anything in Ritschl with which he could agree. So fundamentally different are the directions. In view of the widespread acceptance of Ritschl's conception of the kingdom of God, it is worth asking: Did Luther really interpret the second petition of the Lord's Prayer - for in the interpretation of this petition his whole conception of the kingdom of God is found - in the sense of Jesus, so that the thousands who daily pray the Lord's Prayer in the sense of Luther's interpretation are really asking for what Jesus had in mind when he taught his disciples to pray the Lord's Prayer? Or may we perhaps approve of Ritschl's view, which is, after all, essentially that of the Papists and of the present-day enthusiasts, if not entirely, at least in a moderate form? An investigation of this question should not be superfluous in view of the vacillations of our time.

Luther's conception of the kingdom of God is found, as already stated, in condensed brevity in his interpretation of the second petition. According to Luther's explanation, the kingdom of God comes to us "when the heavenly Father gives us his Holy Spirit, that we may believe his holy word by his grace and live godly, here temporally and there eternally." Of course, this exposition is not an actual definition; but what Luther writes here for the people will also serve the theologian to get clear thoughts about the kingdom of God. There are five main points that Luther touches upon in his interpretation. According to Luther's view given here, after the Fall no man is by nature a member of the kingdom of God in the special sense in which the expression is used here. He may be in the kingdom of God, but the kingdom of God, of which Jesus speaks in the second petition, must come to us. Furthermore, according to Luther, the kingdom of God is a kingdom of grace. If we are to become members of this kingdom, God must give us his Holy Spirit. Our membership in the kingdom is therefore a work of God's grace. Thus

This explains why Luther understands the kingdom of God as a spiritual kingdom, a kingdom that has the Holy Spirit as its administrator, the Word of God as its instrument, and faith as its means. The kingdom of God is to him of a spiritual nature with all its ends, means, and purposes. Luther expresses this briefly, "that we believe his holy word by his grace and live godly." Faith and the life of faith according to the holy Word of God is therefore, according to Luther, the characteristic of the members of this kingdom, which already exists in time - "here temporally" - but will one day be revealed in glory in blessed eternity - "there eternally". This short interpretation of the second petition therefore contains everything essential that can be said about the kingdom of God.

In his Large Catechism, Luther also gives us a clear answer to the question: What does the kingdom of God mean? To this question he answers: "Nothing else [is now called God's kingdom], but as we have heard above in faith, that God sent his Son, Christ our Lord, into the world, that he redeemed us and set us free from the power of the devil, and brought us to himself and reigned as a king of righteousness, life, and blessedness against sin, death, and an evil conscience. To this end he also gave his Holy Spirit, who brought these things to us by his holy word, and enlightened and strengthened us in the faith by his power. Therefore we pray, first of all, that these things may be strengthened among us, and that his name may be magnified by the holy word of God and Christian life, both that we who have received it may continue in it and increase daily, and that it may gain favor and acceptance among other people, and that it may pass mightily through the world, so that many of them may come to the kingdom of grace and be made partakers of salvation, brought by the Holy Spirit, so that we may all abide in one kingdom, beginning now, forever. (*Trigl.*, 710.)

That in Luther's view the kingdom of God is nothing other than the Christian church, he clearly testifies in a letter to Spalatin, in which he writes: "Who with the other passage of the kingdom and the righteousness of God stands thus: The kingdom of God is the church of Christ, which is governed by the word of God. Rom . 14, 17: "The kingdom of God is peace, righteousness, and joy in the Holy Spirit." Luk 17, 21: 'The kingdom of God is within you.* The righteousness of God is faith, as you know from Rom . 1, 17. For in the Greek it is plainly read, βασιλεία *& εοῦ καί δικαιοσύνη αυτού,* that is, of God. Therefore seek ye first the kingdom of God, etc., that is, before all things, by teaching, by hearing, by considering the Gospel, see to it that faith and the knowledge of God be spread much and far; then temporal things shall fall to," etc. (St. L. XXla, 452.)

Thus Luther's definition of the kingdom of God coincides perfectly with that of the church. According to his explanation, the kingdom of God is not

an earthly-worldly kingdom, but a spiritual kingdom. "Christ's kingdom is a spiritual kingdom, which is here on earth, and yet is not earthly, but heavenly. No king was ever able to set up a kingdom which is on earth, and yet is not earthly, but heavenly." (VI, 861.) Members of this church are all who desire to be saved by Christ's satisfactio vicaria alone, and therefore place their confidence in Christ's merit alone. Luther writes: "This is called God's people and the Christian Church, who rely on nothing but God's grace and mercy. The others may boast of the church or even call themselves angels, but they are not for that reason. . . . Therefore they may well be converted, and cease from their false confidence of their works, for there is nothing at all in it." (111, 1697.) Since the kingdom of God or the church is the totality of those who believe in JEsum Christum, the God-man Redeemer, and since no one can "see or feel" this faith, according to Luther God's kingdom is invisible to men. He emphasizes this very sharply to the Romans and zealots who want to make the church an external, visible, and worldly kingdom. He writes: "Therefore the papist Heinzen and Heinzian Papists understand much less what church or God is, neither a cow nor a sow understands; it is a high, deep, hidden thing, the church, that no one may know it nor see it, but must grasp and believe only in baptism, sacrament and word. Doctrines of men, ceremonies, plates, long skirts, bishop's hat, and all the papal pomp, only lead far from it into hell." (XVII, 1338.) The marks of the church or kingdom are only the word and sacraments, "wherever this gospel is preached pure and loud, there is Christ's kingdom. And this mark of the church or kingdom of Christ cannot deceive thee. For where the Word is, there is the Holy Ghost. . . . Outward good works can be deceptive, since they are also found among the Gentiles. Therefore the papacy errs, which holds that there are other marks of the church than the word. And because they say that they are the church because they follow a different way of life, they deceive themselves. For the word has always been the only, perpetual, and unmistakable mark of the church. The Jews also err, who wait for a bodily kingdom of their Messiah." (VI, 30.)

Thus Luther. It is worth the effort to seriously examine Luther's pronouncements on the kingdom of God, because even the newer ones, who reject Luther's view, seek to substantiate their erroneous opinions with evidence from Luther. The fact is that contemporary theology has completely renounced Luther's teaching on the kingdom of God. One generally walks in the paths of Ritschl and the Roman Church. According to Ritschl, however, the kingdom of God is "the community of moral action from the motive of love." (R. u. V. Ill,

274.) According to Ritschl, "only Kant ... recognized the leading meaning of the kingdom of God as a connection of people through virtue laws". (R. u. V. Ill, 11.) This train of thought in Ritschl can be well understood if one considers that, according to Ritschl, "Christianity is directed toward the moral organization of mankind." (R. u. B. Ill, 14.) With this, however, Ritschl has placed himself in the camp of the "papist Heinzen." But that his conception of the kingdom of God and its purpose has found such general acceptance shows how generally one has done away with Christ's satiskaotio vioaria and has returned to the papist doctrine of works. Not all, however, who hold out in Ritschl's camp use such plain language as Ritschl. This is especially true of American theologians. Stevens, in his *New Testament Theology,* p. 28, defines the kingdom of God thus, "The kingdom of God is the domain in which God's holy will is done in and among men," a definition that says abundantly little. Vollmer writes in his *New Testament Sociology*, p. 28: "The kingdom of God is an ideal, but partially realized society, composed of all those willing to submit to divine control, scattered all over the world and found in every social group." That the Ritschlian ideal is in his mind is proved by his words, "a society composed of all those willing to submit to divine control," and that, according to his further elaboration, this kingdom is held together "through the laws of love, service, and sacrifice." Clearer is the definition of the notorious Rauschenbusch: "The kingdom of God is humanity organized according to the will of God." *(A Theology for the Social Gospel,* p. 142.) Similar are the definitions of a Shailer Mathews, Hastings, Fosdick, Royce, Gardner, etc., men whose judgment counts for much in the sectarian circles of our country.

How is this earthly-worldly view of the kingdom of God to be justified? They say that Christ himself is to blame for the fact that people are so divided about his kingdom. For he did not define the expression "kingdom of God" logically; it is therefore quite natural that people should have different opinions about it. Furthermore, it is thought that it does not matter much how the expression is understood, since it is only a figure that says little. Christ found the expression "kingdom of God" among his contemporaries and adapted himself to their mode of expression and their circle of thought, in order to be able to direct his work among them all the better. Nowhere, however, did Christ reject the Jewish materialistic conception of the kingdom of God. In general, it is claimed, Christ himself developed his teaching on the kingdom of God only little by little and modified it accordingly, the more his calling as the bringer of salvation became clear to him. Finally, one must keep in mind that the expression "kingdom of God" was only a slogan of Jesus, which soon fell into oblivion in the church.

to explain why the expression Wohl is frequently found in the evangelists, but less so in the other New Testament writings. The later writers would have been highly indifferent to the meaning of the expression. (Vollmer, *New Testament Sociology,* p. 46. 51.)

The practical results of such an argumentation and view are obvious. He who speaks in this way cannot possibly understand the real purpose of the coming of Jesus in the flesh; indeed, he will not know what to do with the doctrine of Christ in the person and ministry of Jesus. To such a man Christ can only be a man according to His person and only a teacher of virtue according to His office. Ritschl and the present-day enthusiasts of our country act very consistently when they do the satisfactio vicaria out of the means and thus destroy the whole Gospel - the word of reconciliation through the God-human Redeemer of the world, 2 Cor. 5, 18-21. No less consistently do the Papists also act, who make a mockery of the goods of the spiritual kingdom of JEsu - Christ's righteousness and merit, the forgiveness of sins and blessedness by grace alone through faith in the Son of God who died for all. The reason for this is easy to find. Luther rightly emphasizes that he who would understand Christ's kingdom must renounce the works doctrine. But this doctrine of works is found in all "Papist Heinzen" as well as in all "Heinzian Papists," and indeed as the foundation of their whole perverted conception of the kingdom of God. They do not want a spiritual kingdom with forgiveness of sins and blessedness through faith in a God-human Saviour, but they do want a "moral organization" of men, which owes its existence to the preaching of the law. A false goal is set and sought to be attained by false means. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if the whole theology of such men thus becomes this world's religion. He who conceives of the kingdom of God as an earthly one is quite satisfied with his achievements if he has created an organization that is "as morally developed as possible," or if he has brought up good earthlings. This is as far as he can go with his preaching of the law and his doctrine of works, and this is as far as he wants to go with his wrong conception of the kingdom of God. He who has once emptied the gospel of its contents no longer looks upward, where the exalted Saviour prepares dwellings for His own, but downward, where he finds a virtueless humanity to be morally improved. It follows quite naturally from such a reversal that the State and the Church are mixed together, as we find in all the papist and Ritschlian enthusiasts. To them, after all, the State can only be the ennobled Church and the Church the ennobled State. Their whole theology is just upside down. But such a theology cannot make a single man blessed. According to Scripture, only those who are the children of God and heirs of beatitude are saved.

The only ones who believe in Christ as their only redeemer and want to be saved through His substitutionary satisfaction alone are those who are under the curse. He who deals with the law is under the curse, Gal. 3, 10. Thus all "Heinzian Papists" and "Papist Heinzen" are after the damnation of men. To them the crucified Christ with his righteousness is a nuisance, and therefore they have invented a "Christianity" to which the old, earthly-directed and virtuous Adam need not take offence. But in doing so they have pronounced the death sentence on their theology and on themselves.

But what about the criticism that has been levelled at Christ and his Kingdom preaching? Whoever takes a closer look at this criticism will soon realize that it comes from men who have broken with the Gospel and have therefore "pronounced the death sentence on themselves and their theology. It is said that Christ, at the beginning of his teaching activity, made himself comfortable to the Jewish materialistic conception of the kingdom of God, as the restored ideal Jewish state after the pattern of David and Solomon, in order in this way to win his listeners for his preaching. But of such an accommodation we find nothing in Scripture. Nor do the Gospels with a single syllable imply that Christ in His teaching activity made Himself comfortable to any theory then prevailing. On the contrary, Jesus never failed to make the difference between His teaching and that of the Pharisees very clear to His hearers, Matth. 16, 6-12. Therefore, Christ also made the term "kingdom of God" very familiar to His hearers. The kingdom of God came to them (αρα εφ& *ασεν έφ' υμάς*), "if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God," Matth. 12:^8. Here JEsus shows most clearly the starting-point of His kingdom. The kingdom of God comes to men when they are delivered from the power of the devil by Christ through the Spirit of God. The kingdom of God does not have to do with the "moralization of men", but with their deliverance from the kingdom of Satan, in which the whole sinful world of men is by nature. How this is done was clearly shown by Jesus when He preached "the gospel of the kingdom of God" in Galilee. There, on the avoidance, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand," went forth the cry of repentance, *Μετανοείτε καί πιστεύετε εν τω εναγγελίφ*, Mark. 1, 15. Repentance and faith are therefore the means by which man has access to the kingdom of God brought about by Christ through the Spirit of God. If a man believes the gospel of the kingdom of God through the Holy Spirit, he is a member of the kingdom of God, which, like the means, is itself spiritual in nature. That his hearers, at least in part, understood this sermon of Jesus, he clearly testifies on another occasion. There he says: "The law and the prophets prophesy until John; and

from that time the kingdom of God is preached by the gospel *(ἡ βασιλεία τον ὕεον εναγγελίζεται),* and everyone enters by force" . *(πας είς αντην βιάζεται),* Luk. 16, 16. There were therefore many among JEsu's hearers who well understood his doctrine of the kingdom of God, although he did not conform to the Pharisaic conception of the kingdom of God, but preached repentance and faith; for, according to his own statement, "every man pressed in." The Pharisees, however, did not. As their whole conception of the kingdom of God was earthly and external, so was their piety and righteousness, which is why the Lord punished them, Luk. 16, 14 f. Even before the teaching of Jesus there were many in Israel who did not hope for the restoration of an earthly kingdom but for the spiritual kingdom where the Messiah would give forgiveness of sins to His people. So Mary (Luk. 1,54), Zacharias (Luk. 1,77), Simeon (Luk. 2, 30), Hanna (Luk. 2, 38) etc. That is why John the Baptist's sermon was so powerful. When he preached "of the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," then "went out unto him all the country of Judaea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins" *(εξομολογούμενοι τάς αμαρτίας αύτών),* Mark. 1,

4. 5 Christ therefore did not use the term "kingdom of God" to pander to the ideas of the Pharisees, but to present the true facts of it to the people of Israel. The Saviour had come to preach to the wretched, to bind up the brokenhearted; to preach a release to the captives, an opening to the bound; to preach a gracious year of the Lord, etc., Isa. 61, 1 f. And because the LORD had given him a learned tongue to speak with the weary in due season, Isa. 50, 4, "the people also were astonished at his doctrine: for he preached mightily, and not as the scribes," Matth. 7, 28. 29.*) He who therefore asserts that Christ used the expression "kingdom of God" in order to accommodate himself to the circle of thought of his contemporaries, does not understand the Scriptures, and speaks "from his own interpretation."

The expression "kingdom of God" used by Christ was therefore not a mere figure of speech, but the most real designation of a thing clearly stated by Him and well understood by His penitent hearers. Hence, when Vollmer writes, "The term contains a figure and hence is suggestive rather than expressive of a single, sharply limited conception. Jesus used the term inclusively, *i. e.,* expressing by it a variety of phases and aspects of the general idea. And this very wideness, comprehensiveness, and elasticity is a drawback when a precise definition is attempted"' *(New Testament Sociology,* p. 51), so this does not agree with what Scripture says about it.

*) This is the actual fact as Scripture itself presents it to us.

172 Did Luther understand the second request in the sense of JEsu?

Says. Christ spoke and preached to be understood by the people. The scriptures testify to this in many places. It says that many believed in Him, Matth. 21,32; Joh. 4, 42; 8, 31 etc. Yes, so many believed in Him that the Pharisees cursed the people, Joh. 7, 49. This already proves that the believers in Israel were people of a different mind than the earthly-minded Pharisees. They believed, as John tells us, when the Savior told them: "He who believes in me, as the scripture says, from his body will flow rivers of living water", Joh. 7, 38. When JEsus told them this, many of the people who heard this speech said: "He is Christ", Joh. 7, 41. 7, 41. Therefore, when JEsus preached repentance and faith to the people for membership in the kingdom of God, He was not only at pains to make them understand the necessary expressions and turns of words, but the people understood them. This is still more clearly evident from the glorious Sermon on the Mount, Matth. 5-7. There the Lord describes in clear words the subjects of the kingdom of God as such as are spiritually poor *(πτωχοί τω πνενματι),* meek, merciful, pure in heart, peaceable, etc., who suffer affliction, who hunger and thirst after righteousness, etc., Matt. 5:1-10. Such, according to Christ's emphatic statement, are partakers of the kingdom of God *(αυτών εστιν ή βασιλεία των ουρανών).* Here also, as in Mark. 1, 14 f., the HErr requires repentance and faith from all who wish to belong to the kingdom of God. He who is neither penitent nor believes cannot enter the kingdom of God; for "not all who say to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven *(εἴσελευσεται εις την βασιλείαν των ουρανών),* but those who do the will (believe, Joh. 5, 40) of my Father which is in heaven," Matth. 7, 21. We see, JEsus does not use figures of speech, but sharp, clear words, to cut out all externalization of the salvation he preaches. He does not want doubt, but demands understanding. "Hear me, all of you, and grasp it!" *(καί σύνετε),* he calls out Mark. 7, 14 to the people; and he rebukes his disciples when, in consequence of outward conceptions of the kingdom of God, they did not understand him: "Are ye then also so without understanding?" Mark. 7:18 Therefore we must not excuse the wrong understanding of the kingdom of God by saying that there is a figure in the expression that does not clearly express what Jesus wanted with His sermon about the kingdom of God. In view of what was said, the people will not have been in doubt about it, when he exhorted them, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness." Matth. 6, 32, or when he taught his disciples to pray: "Your kingdom come!" Matth. 6, 10. In His whole sermon of salvation Jesus only knows about one kingdom of God, namely the spiritual one, in which the spiritual goods of righteousness and salvation are distributed to those who believe with all their heart, Matth. 8, 10-12.

From what has been said, it is also clear that Christ did not modify His opinion of the kingdom of God. Vollmer, in his book *New Testament Sociology,* asserts, "Jesus may have modified and clarified His conceptions in the course of His public ministry, as growing men do." (p. 51.) Scripture teaches just the opposite. Christ was not a "growing man" in the sense that human prophets were. He was from the beginning the *άπό & εοϋ διδάσκαλος*, John 3:2. But as *άπό & εον διδάσκαλος*, JEsus taught at the very beginning of His teaching ministry, when He preached the gospel of the kingdom of God, "Repent, and believe the gospel." Mark. 1, 15. This μετανοείτε *καί πιστεύετε* as a condition of belonging to the βασιλεία *τον ϋεοϋ* JEsus never modified. This is proved by his exegesis concerning the kingdom of God, which he gave to Pilate at the close of his teaching ministry. To the question of the Roman governor whether he was King of the Jews, he answers clearly and sharply, without equivocation, "My kingdom is not of this world *(εκ τον κόσμον τούτον).* If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight threateningly that I might not be answered to the Jews. But now is my kingdom not from hence" *(ούκ εστιν εντεύθεν),* John 18:36. If Vollmer judges of this passage, "When our Lord declared, 'My kingdom is not of this world,' He meant to imply that it did not originate in this world, was not founded on the principles of this world, and will not use for its spread and protection the means of this world" (p. 53), his exegesis is not complete. What Christ told Pilate above all was that his kingdom was essentially quite different in nature from the kingdoms of this world. This is proved by his further exegesis: "I was born unto this, and came into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. He who is of the truth hears my voice", Joh. 18, 37. Whoever compares the two passages carefully will find that they teach nothing else about the kingdom of God than what Jesus already said in Mark. 1, 14 f. at the beginning of His teaching ministry. But also after His resurrection Jesus did not modify His opinion about the kingdom of God as stated in statu exinanitionis. All four evangelists prove this to us. According to Mark, the Risen Lord rebuked his disciples for their unbelief and hardness of heart, that they had not believed those who had seen him risen, and commanded them, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark. 16, 15 f. According to Apost. 1, 1 f. the Risen Lord instructed those who had come together and asked Him, "Lord, dost Thou at this time raise up again the kingdom to Israel?" thus, "It behoveth you not to know the time or hour which the Father hath reserved for His power, but . . . ye shall be my witnesses." As Christ preached repentance and faith, so his disciples were to

go out into all the world with this sermon. So it is clear: Christ did not modify his opinion about the kingdom of God neither before nor after his resurrection. Always he remained consistent. What he said at the height of his teaching effectiveness to the Pharisees who asked him, "When is the kingdom of God coming?" that was always the core and star of his whole kingdom preaching: "The kingdom of God does not come with outward gestures; neither will it be said, Behold, here or there it is! For behold, the kingdom of God is within you," Luk 17:20, 21. Let the εντός *υμών* be taken as one pleases, as "in you" or as "among you," in either case it denotes a kingdom which is not external, but internal, not earthly, but spiritual; as Luther also remarks in a marginal gloss on this passage, "'External gestures,' that is, God's kingdom does not stand in works bound to place, food, clothing, time, person, but in faith and love freely."

It has at last been thought that the idea which Christ associated with the term "kingdom of God" was gradually forgotten. Vollmer remarks: "The great idea, and even, the very term, soon passed out of the consciousness of the Church, and thus its full meaning was first obscured and then forgotten." (P. 51.) We cannot agree with this view either. It does not agree with the facts. The expression "kingdom of God" is found sufficiently in the other New Testament writings; and as to the thing signified by it, it has been the constant theme of apostolic preaching. He who denies this, does it in the interest of his false theory, which contends against God's word. That the apostles neither misunderstood the expression "kingdom of God," nor forgot the thing signified by it, is most clearly proved by the sayings concerning it. As Christ preached a spiritual kingdom of God, so also Paul, who expressly says: "The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. Whosoever serveth Christ therein is acceptable unto God, and worthy of men," Rom . 14, 17 f. Here the apostle describes the kingdom of God as a purely spiritual one, the essence of which consists in the goods given by the Holy Spirit: righteousness, peace and joy. Therefore we have a direct parallel to Luk 17, 20 f. From this kingdom are thus also excluded all sin-servers, not only the gross and public, such as fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, soft-hearted, boy-abusers, thieves, miserly, drunkards, robbers, etc., but all who are not washed, sanctified and justified by the name of the Lord JESUS and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. 6, 9-11. Furthermore, according to the apostle's clear explanation, all who want to be saved by the work of the law are excluded, Gal. 3, 10; 5, 18-22. For these are just as much opposed to the Holy Spirit as the gross slaves of vice, Gal. 5, 18-22, and therefore cannot receive the

It is clear that the apostles, just like Christ Himself, taught a Kingdom of God that is spiritual and heavenly in nature and whose membership is obtained through repentance and faith. All "Papist Heinzen" and "Heinzian Papists," therefore, who place the kingdom of God in the outward communion of the church, have no Scriptural ground under their feet, but have borrowed their thoughts from their reason.

Unnecessary trouble has also been taken with the scriptural passages which describe the kingdom of God partly as already present, but partly as still future. He who holds fast the scriptural truth of the kingdom of God will not be confused when the Scriptures teach: The kingdom of God is coming, the kingdom of God will come, and: The kingdom of God has already come. Wherever the Holy Spirit works his work of grace in the hearts of men through the gospel, there is God's kingdom present; for there are believing children of God, who are members of the kingdom of Christ and of God. Thus the Scripture speaks very intelligibly when it says both, The kingdom of God is coming, and: The kingdom of God has come, Luk. 17, 20 f.; Matth. 12, 28. But Scripture also speaks clearly when it says in a special sense: The kingdom of God will come, 2 Tim. 4, 1. The kingdom of God is just now veiled from the eyes of men: it is an invisible kingdom, precisely because no man can "examine his heart and kidneys". But it should not always remain this way. To the believing members of the kingdom, who are already living by faith in communion with the triune God, the revealed glory is at hand. The King of the kingdom, who now reigns in a hidden way through Word and Sacrament in His believers, will one day appear visibly, "to judge the living and the dead with His appearing and with His kingdom," 2 Tim. 4:1. This appearing and kingdom the apostle therefore testifies to Timothy most clearly, and after Christ's own example, Matt. 13:36-43: "Then shall the righteous shine as the sun in their Father's kingdom," v. 43. The invisible kingdom of grace will therefore be followed by the revealed kingdom of glory. And to this the believers are to keep their eyes fixed.

If we summarize all that Scripture says about the kingdom of God, we find that this agrees well with Luther's interpretation of the second petition. According to Scripture, too, the kingdom of God comes only "when the heavenly Father gives us his Holy Spirit, that we may believe his holy word by his grace and live godly, here temporally and there eternally." Every other conception of the kingdom of God, as we find it among the papists, enthusiasts, and newer theologians, judges itself: it contends both AGAINST Scripture and AGAINST reason and history: AGAINST Scripture, because it denies the clear doctrine of Scripture; AGAINST reason, because reason after all

It is impossible for a kingdom so foreign to the spirit of Christ and His Word as that of the pope or the zealots to be identified with the kingdom of Christ; against history, because the kingdom of God in its perfection has never yet been realized in an external, visible kingdom. We must therefore look for the kingdom of God where Scripture tells us to look for it, namely, in the hearts of the faithful children of God who have been born again of the Holy Spirit through the Gospel.

What we have expressed in the above are only simple, long-known Scriptural truths. But precisely these simple truths of Scripture, which our Lutheran Church has always emphasized against sects and papists, are core truths that we must not allow to be distorted, precisely because this would obscure the whole goal of Christ's Christhood set before us. One wants to form the Kingdom of God earthly in order to help the world that is perishing because of sin. A Christian kingdom on earth is intended to bring recovery to mankind, which is sinking into sin. But such an enterprise must necessarily fail, because it misunderstands the end and means as well as the purpose of Christianity, which alone can bring salvation to the world. An earthly kingdom of virtue brought about externally by the law is as far removed from the true kingdom of God as a lawless Sodom. What can help the world in this late, sorrowful time is only repentance and faith, which the Holy Spirit works through the Word of God, proclaimed in all clarity and sincerity by those who really know what the second petition of the Lord's Prayer is all about. Only those who abide by the scriptural conception of the kingdom of God can also preach the kingdom of God to the world. And that, above all, is what is needed.

J. T. M.'

"Thy word is truth." Joh. 17, 17

We live in the time close to the last day. It is evil time. The evil enemy is serious now. He is especially after the word of truth, the Holy Scriptures. He wants to steal it from the Christians. And he succeeds only too well. A new theology has arisen that considers the Bible to be a book full of errors and contradictions. There are only a few pastors left in the sectarian churches who still unreservedly confess that the Bible is a book that is heavenly different from all other books on earth, a book without errors and defects. Certainly, it is evil time. Whereas in former times the wicked enemy set about to pervert and falsify the Scriptures, he now rudely goes out and touches the Word of Truth, the Holy Scriptures, with raw hands, and speaks through the mouths of distinguished and highly respected theologians, pro-

The same professors and pastors tell the people that they must not trust everything and every word that the Scriptures say. Before such deceit of Satan Christians should arm themselves with weapons of truth and follow those in Berea who are praised: "They searched the Scriptures daily, whether it be so", Apost. 17, 11. 17:11; and if they do so, they will know the truth of the word: "Search the book of the Lord, and read; there shall be no lack of any of them; neither shall this be missed, nor that," Isa. 34:16; and this will strengthen their faith, and they will be more and more glad and assured of the truth. The following solution of some apparent contradictions may also serve this purpose.

Deut. 10:6 says, "And the children of Israel went out from the wells of Jacob unto Moser. There Aaron died, and there he is buried." This place Moser, where Aaron died and was buried, was on mount Hor; for so we read 4 Mos. 33:38, "Then Aaron the priest went up into mount Hor, according to the commandment of the LORD, and died there." Aaron died in Moser on mount Hor. But how does this agree with Num. 33:31 ff? V. 31: "From Moseroth they departed, and encamped in Bne-jakan." Hereupon five other campsites are mentioned, the last being Kades. And then it is said v. 37 f., "From Kadesh they went forth, and encamped in mount Hor, at the border of the land of Edom. Then Aaron the priest went up into mount Hor, according to the commandment of the LORD, and died there." Hereupon after Moseroth follow a whole series of encampments, until they came to mount Hor, where Aaron died; but according to Deut. 10, he died in Moseroth. After this they went from Moseroth to Bnehakan, but according to Deut. 10 they went from Beroth Bnehakan to Moser. How can this be rhymed? The explanations about it were already in the antiquity far apart. One counted this passage among those, quae solvi nequeant. It was called an intricatissimum locum, a lapsum librariorum, an insoluble contradiction. - A very good and natural solution, however, is this: One takes Moseroth (5 Mos. 10, 6) as a certain place on Mount Hor, where Aaron died. From this one distinguishes Moseroth (4 Mos. 33, 31), which is plural and denotes a whole landscape. Further, the wells of the Jakans (Luther: Beroth Bne-Jakan), 5 Mos. 10:6, are distinguished from the city of Bne-Jakan, 4Mos. 33, 31. Between this city and those wells lay the places named 4 Mos. 33:32-37, last Kades. V. 37a reads, "From Kadesh they departed." To where? To the place called Deut. 10:6, namely, to the wells of the Jakans, and encamped at Mount Hor, on the border of the land of Edom. And from there they went out to Moser, where Aaron died and was buried. So Moser is a place on Mount Hor, and Moseroth is the countryside that begins several days' journey from here.

2 Sam. 23, 8: "These are the names of the mighty men of David: Jehosheb-Bashbeth the son of Hachmoni, the chiefest of three; he, Adino the Esnite, slew over eight hundred at one time." How does the parallel passage, 1 Chron. 12:11, agree with this, "And this is the number of David's heroes: Jashabesh the son of Hachmoni, the noblest of thirty; he lifted up his spear, and smote three hundred at one time"? Here we first ask, Why does it say eight hundred there, but here only three hundred? Evidently the Holy Spirit here tells in two different places of two different victories of the same hero. As to the names, however, Jasabeam and Jehosheb-Basheth denote the same man; so do the surnames: Tachmonitc and son of Machmoni. The latter denotes the father himself, the latter the surname which came to him on his father's side. The same hero is also called Adino, the Esnite, in the former place, by which probably his birthplace is signified. This epithet is omitted in the Chronicles passage; whereas here are the words, "He lifted up his spear." Thus, although the two passages are different, they do not contradict each other at all.

2 Sam. 24, 9 a: "And Joab gave unto the king the sum of the people that were numbered. And there were in Israel eight hundred thousand strong men that drew sword." According to 1 Chron. 22:5, however, the number is 1, 100,000. Why is the latter number 300,000 greater than the former? This is very easily explained by noting that in the Samuel passage the orders or legions of David are omitted, but in the Chronicles passage they are counted. For from 1 Chron. 28:1 we see that the children of Israel formed twelve orders or legions according to their twelve tribes. "But every order had twenty-four thousand." That was 12X24,000 = 288,000. "Now the children of Israel according to their number were chief of the fathers, and above a thousand." This makes 12,000 chiefs or captains. Adding these to the troops mentioned gives the exact total of 300,000. These legions of the king are not counted in the Samuel passage. If we add them to the 800,000 named there, we have exactly the sum mentioned in the Chronicles passage.

2 Sam. 24:95, "And in Judah five hundred thousand men." According to 1 Chron. 22, 5, however, the number is 470,000. Why is the latter number less than the former by 30,000? Answer: In Judah there were 470,000 who drew sword. The 30,000 not mentioned were light troops, such as slingers and archers. Such were also in the Jewish army. Thus we read 2 Chron. 26, 14, that king Uzziah sent for the army not only shields, spears, helmets and armor, but also bows and sling stones for the light troops. Zech. 9, 13-15 bows, arrows and sling stones are also mentioned. - There is another explanation. To

1 Chron. 22, 5, we may add v. 6, which reads, "Levi and Benjamin he counted not among these." So in the number 470,000 these two tribes are missing. Assuming that they were counted in the Samuel passage, we have a good explanation of the higher sum there, 500,000. But in no case is there any real contradiction here, and the unbelieving modern critics blaspheme the Scriptures when they say, "It is quite certain that we must not expect to find in the Scriptures scientific precision in matters of numbers. . . . Only hard and fast, and therefore unreasonable, notions of divine inspiration could lead us to expect absolute 'accuracy in matters of mere detail. ... In all matters not directly bearing on morals and religion there is the ordinary human element in Bible records." 1)

1 Kings 1:1-4: "And when king David was old and well advanced in years, he could not be warmed, though they covered him with garments. And his servants said unto him, Let them find my lord the king a damsel, a virgin, to stand before the king, and to be his nurse, and to sleep in his arms, and to warm my lord the king. And they sought a fair damsel throughout all the coasts of Israel, and found Wisag of Sunem, and brought her unto the king. And she was a very fair damsel, and nursed the king, and ministered unto him. But the king knew her not." David was nearly seventy years old and lacked the necessary body heat. He had aged prematurely and grown weak because of the countless cares and troubles he had endured in his eventful life. He could no longer get warm. When the inner warmth fades, even the best clothes are of no use. Then he was helped in the way just described. What was Abisag's position with David? Was she entrusted to him as his wife? Without any doubt, although this is not expressly mentioned. It would be against all respectability and piety thus to consort with a virgin out of wedlock. The expression here used ZZZZ XXX, to lie on the bosom, to sleep in the arms, is used of marriage 2 Sam. 12:3 and Micah 7:5. If Abisag had been only David's servant, why should Solomon have refused her to his brother Adonijah for a wife in marriage, as we read I Kings 2:21-24? From the expression: "But the king did not recognize her" one cannot draw the conclusion that she was not his wife; on the contrary, the truth is contained in it that he might well have recognized her if this had been in his will. It is objected that the text reads, "She nursed the king and served him." Was she not, then, only his servant? Answer: Yes, of course she was his servant, and especially in that she gave him, the weak old man, the warmth he lacked.

1) Robert Tuck, *Bible Difficulties,* New York, 1891, p. 401 f.

...and replaced her. But was not this a service which an honourable and pious man might accept only from his wife? But it is said, If Abishag was the king's wife, David's son Adonijah ought not to have desired her to be his wife by Bathsheba. But Bathsheba said to Solomon, 1 Kings 2:21, "Latz Abisag of Sunem to thy brother Adonijah to wife." Answer: Solomon's mother made this request, but it was not granted. The law was 3 Mos. 18, 7: "Thou shalt not bare thy father's shame, nor thy mother's shame: it is thy mother, therefore thou shalt not bare her shame." Solomon did right in not granting the request. Adonijah sinned against the law and the king by his desire, and he paid for it with his life.

1 Chron. 12, 38 is called "Joel, the brother of Nathan" among the contending heroes. But 2 Sam. 23, 36 it says "Jegeal, the son of Nathan". The Septuagint has "son" in both places. It does not follow, however, that this oldest translation of the Hebrew Bible had the word "son" in both places in the original text, but simply changed the one place because of the apparent contradiction, as it often shows a tendency to do. The Reformed commentator Capellus says: Necesse est, alterutram lectionem esse vitiosam; non enim potest idem homo eiusdem esse simul et filius et frater. This is genuinely Reformed. One finds all sorts of errors in Scripture! But what is the simple fact? Joel, who is named in the Chronicles passage, and Jegeal, who is named in the Samuel passage, are without all doubt not one and the same person at all, but the one was the brother, the other the son of Nathan. This is already clearly indicated by the different spelling of these names.

1 Chron. 22, 11. 12: "When Gad came to David, he said unto him, Thus saith the LORD, Choose thee either three years of teuration," etc. 2 Sam. 24, 13: But it is said, "Gad came to David, and told him, and said unto him, Wilt thou that seven years of teuration come into thy land?" Here seven, there only three years of teuration are mentioned. How are we to reconcile these two different numbers? Various explanations have been tried. The best is this: In both passages three years of teurung are meant, which may be yet to come. There had been several years of teurung before. These are not mentioned in Chronicles, but only in Samuel. In the first place, then, the sense is, Shall there be yet another three years of teuration? In the second passage, on the other hand, the meaning is: "Shall your land be afflicted with a seven-year plague, including the last three years that have passed? For three years' tribulation had already passed because of the Gibeonites. 2 Sam. 21, 1: "There was also a plague in David's days, three years in succession: and David sought the face of the LORD. And the LORD said, Because of Saul, that he slew the Gibeonites." Ver-

It was the fourth year since the Lord had spoken this to David. In this fourth year the Lord had let it rain and thus testified that he was reconciled again; however, angered by the king's new sin, he set three more years of turmoil, which together with the previous three and the one that had just passed make seven years.

1 Chron. 22, 25: "So David gave Arnan for the room of gold, by weight six hundred shekels." 2 Sam. 24:24, but we read, "So David bought the threshing-floor and the ox for fifty shekels of silver." There: David gave Arnan six hundred shekels of gold; here: he gave him only fifty shekels of silver. On this an older commentator remarks: quae nimis magna videtur discrepantia; a more recent one: "There is an apparent contradiction between the amounts paid to Araunah, as given in the older and the later histories. In 2 Sam. 24 it will be seen that the negotiation was strictly for the materials of sacrifice. What Araunah offered was not the estate, but distinctly 'the oxen for burnt sacrifice and threshing instruments and other instruments of the oxen for wood.' The fifty shekels of silver would be an adequate price for these materials of sacrifice, but we cannot imagine it to be a suitable price to pay for a man's estate." The matter is at once clear, if we suppose that David gave fifty shekels of silver only for the threshing-floor on which the altar was erected, and for the sacrificial animal and the rural implements, but paid six hundred shekels of gold for the whole field with the buildings upon it, where the temple was afterwards erected. This answer is also commanded by the text itself, in that in the Chronicles passage the whole area is mentioned, for which David paid in gold, but in the Samuel passage only lesser things are mentioned, for which he presented a smaller sum in silver.

2 Chron. 9, 25: "And Solomon had four thousand chariot horses." How does this agree with I Kings 4:26: "And Solomon had forty thousand chariot horses" ? Some commentators confess here again an insoluble contradiction. Others state a slight spelling mistake in the Hebrew four or forty, to which, however, a better one very correctly remarks: quae explicatio nimis cabbalistica est. Very easily one gets over the difficulty by noting the following: In the Book of Kings the number of chariot horses is described at the beginning of Solomon's reign, but in Chronicles that at the end of his reign. Let us distinguish between the different times, then these passages agree very well, and all doubt vanishes. According to the context, the text itself is also based on this difference in time. 1 Kings 4:26 speaks of forty thousand chariot horses. This was right at the beginning of Solomon's reign; because soon after Hiram congratulated the new king and rejoiced highly, 1 Kings 5, 7. On the other hand 2 Chron. 9, 25, where only four thousand chariot horses are mentioned, falls completely at the end of the reign of Salo-

mos; for immediately after, v. 31, his death is already reported. It is also not to be wondered at that the number of his chariot horses was so reduced at the end. For God had expressly commanded in Deut. 17:16 concerning the future king, "Only that he keep not many horses." And the reason why he should not keep many horses is also given there. For this reason Solomon gradually did away with the many horses he had at first, and finally he had only the tenth part, namely four thousand. This was shortly before his death.

Ps. 60:2, "When he [David] had fought with the Syrians of Mesopotamia, and with the Syrians of Zobah; when Joab returned, and smote the Edomites in the valley of salt, twelve thousand." How does this agree with 2 Sam. 8:13: "David also made him a name, when he returned, and smote the Syrians in the valley of salt, eighteen thousand"; and further, 1 Chron. 19:12: "And Abishai the son of Zeruiah smote the Edomites in the valley of salt eighteen thousand"? The modern critics complain here also of a supposed contradiction. Even the ancient doubters cried, Est dubium, quod conciliari nequeat, nisi concessa alicubi textus corruptione. Others attempted a solution of the apparent difficulty; most so: Abisai made the first fierce attack against the enemy, and slew six thousand of them. He was followed by Joab, and struck down another twelve thousand. In the book of Chronicles, all eighteen thousand are ascribed to Abishai because he started the battle, but only twelve thousand are ascribed to Joab in the Psalm, whom he himself struck down. This explanation, however, is opposed by the fact that 1 Chron. 19, 12 expressly ascribes to Abishai, not six thousand, but in truth eighteen thousand, whom he "smote," that is, slew. A better explanation, therefore, is this: Abishai, at David's command, went out against the Syrians, and himself slew of them eighteen thousand. Joab afterwards (of his own accord?) went forth, and made the victory a complete one, by slaying twelve thousand himself in addition to the eighteen thousand. In this way everything rhymes in the best way. It is expressly said of Abishai that he slew eighteen thousand. This victory is attributed to king David in 2 Sam. 8, 13, because Abishai undertook this expedition at David's command. Ps. 60, 2, however, the twelve thousand are not ascribed to David, but to Joab, because he began the battle anew and completed the victory. But if it is finally said in the Samuel passage that David made a name for himself through this, it is because this victory was an important one, which is also indicated by the large number of those killed (thirty thousand). By completely subduing the Syrians and their allies, the Edomites, he received a great reputation among the heathen nations. Now, for the first time, the promise of Isaac that Esau would serve his brother was fully fulfilled.

Is. 26, 14: "The dead do not rise." So Luther. The English Bible, "They are deceased, they shall not rise." For

"Deceased" is in the original text Rephaim. What does that mean? The ancient Greek translation, the Septuagint, gives it again with "physicians," also in Ps. 88:11: "Or shall the physicians arise?" But such a translation, according to which the physicians will not rise, is absurd. The Samaritan translation has followed the Septuagint. Some Jewish commentators understand by Rephaim the ungodly before the flood, who, they believed, will not rise. Others refer to the ungodly in general by the name Rephaim. Underlying these translations, however, is a correct hunch, namely: Rephaim comes from rapha, to heal; participle: physician; niphal: to be healed, to attain to health, to obtain bodily strength; from which the meaning is: vigorous men, giants. And this meaning gives the best sense in the text. According to this, Isaiah means to say, The giants do not rise, do not stand, cannot harm us with all their strength, do not come to victory, cannot rule over us. The astute and eminently learned Wittenberg and Leipzig professor D. August Pfeiffer († 1698) remarks on this passage: Rephaim denotant gigantes, quibus denegatur non resurrectio, sed victoria. [2]) The meaning is: The mighty ones of this earth, the giants, the godless, the tyrants, must not harm us. This also fits exceedingly well into the whole context. We will only look at the preceding and following verses. In the preceding verse, v. 13, it is said, "O Lord our God, there are other rulers over us than thou: but we remember thee and thy name only." Hereupon follows our verse: "The dead live not, the giants endure not: for thou hast visited them, and destroyed them, and brought to nought all their remembrance." Then v. 15: "But thou, O LORD, leadest on among the Gentiles, thou leadest on among the Gentiles forever, proving thy glory, and coming afar off to the end of the world."

Apost. 7, 4, Stephen says before the high council of the Jews, "Then he [Abraham] went out of the Chaldean country, and dwelt in Haran; and from thence, his father having died, he brought him over into this land, where ye now dwell." Abraham's father, Tharah, was 205 years old when he died, Gen. 11, 32. "Abram was seventy-five years old when he went out of Haran," Gen. 12, 4. 205-75=130. According to this, Tharah, Abraham's father, must have been 130 years old when Abraham was born. But how does Gen. 11, 26: "Tharah was seventy years old and begat Abram, Nahor and Haran"? So how old was Tharah when he begat Abraham? Was he only seventy, or was he already 130 years old? This question is called quaestionem indissolubilem by Jerome († 420). Scaliger († 1609) says: Elias expectandus est, qui nodum solvat. Another exegete remarks that here Stephen had his memory in the

2) Dubia Vexata, 1713, x. 701. cf. Gerhard, Loc. de Resur. § 38.

Abandoned. Many attempts have been made to explain the apparent contradiction. One has sought refuge in the Samaritan translation, which has only 145 years instead of 205. The death of Tharah has been thought to be a spiritual death. It has been said that the expression "into this land" does not mean the whole land of Canaan, but only the grove of More, Gen. 12:6. Finally, it has been supposed that Abraham went from Haran to Canaan two different times, first when he was seventy-five, and the second time when he was 135 years old, after his father died in Haran. All this, however, cannot be sustained. The simplest and best explanation is rather this: Abraham's birth falls not in the seventieth, but in the hundred and thirty-first year of Tharah, for he is not the firstborn, but the thirdborn. Haran and Nahor were born first; Abraham followed them as the third. One objects: But is not Gen. 11:26 Abraham first? Ans. Yes, but this order is paused to emphasize the dignity, not to express the order of birth. The meaning is: When Tharah was seventy years old, he began to beget offspring. Which of his sons was born first or last is not indicated here. This agrees most beautifully with Stephen's words, "When his father [Tharah] was dead [205 years old], the LORD brought him [Abraham, seventy-five years old] over into this land." And at his birth his father was 130 years old.

Heb. 11:21: "By faith Jacob, when he died, blessed both the sons of Joseph, and bowed himself against the top of his scepter." Jacob bowed down against Joseph's scepter or staff. Gen. 47:31, however, says he inclined toward the head of the bed. For bed, the Hebrew has the word XXXX. But the Septuagint, which is quoted Heb. 11:21, read XXXX, sceptre, and thought of the matter thus: Jacob bowed down against Joseph's sceptre or staff, thereby honoring the authorities TO, and fulfilling Gen. 37:9. Now to which did Jacob incline, to the bed or to the sceptre? It has been asserted that both words meant the same thing, which is never the case. It has been said that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews rendered the saying according to the old Greek translation, and also carried its errors over with him into the New Testament. But this cannot be true, for then the Holy Spirit would confess to this error. Nor can we be satisfied when Gerhard († 1637) and others seek to remove the difficulty by saying that the Epistle to the Hebrews does not here quote Gen. 47:31, but Gen. 48:2: "Then it was told Jacob, Behold, thy son Joseph cometh unto thee. And Israel made himself strong, and sat down in the bed." This is not a proper comparative passage at all. It only says that Jacob sat up out of bed. It mentions nothing at all about Jacob bowing down against Joseph's scepter. But how are we to unite the above passages? We

must hold fast: The Holy Spirit, who in the Hebrew text says Jacob inclined toward the head of the bed, in the Epistle to the Hebrews also made the Septuagint translation, "and inclined toward the head of his (Joseph's) scepter," his own. Jacob did both: he inclined himself against the bed and also against Joseph's staff. So there is no contradiction here anywhere. It is only different circumstances reported in different places of Scripture. It is the same Holy Spirit who quotes the Old Testament word of God in a different form in the New Testament. His main concern is to render the real thing, the correct meaning. Matth. Flacius: "'It is' to be noted that the Old Testament was mostly quoted by the holy writers of the New Testament in such a way that they looked at the sense." 3) August Pfeiffer: "That the passages of the Old Testament are not always quoted in the New Testament according to the wording, does not come from a corruption of the text now before us, but from the fact that by inspiration of the Holy Spirit an explanation of the actual sense of the passage is given." 4) The same: "In the New Testament the sayings of the Old Testament are not always quoted exactly literally, but often according to the sense, and freely, sometimes from the Hebrew text, sometimes from the LXX, sometimes from both. What need of many words if no contradiction is found here? The Holy Spirit has revealed the Old Testament and reserved to Himself the right to explain that in the New Testament. Where this has been done by the Septuagint, its translation has been retained; where it has not, it is quoted according to the basic text. Repeatedly the Holy Spirit has not bound himself either to that translation or to the words of the basic text, but has expressed the meaning in new words. Whatever be the case, the same Holy Spirit, the best interpreter of his own words, has spoken in both places." 5)

Sometimes the writers of the New Testament quote from the Hebrew text, but mostly they take the Septuagint as a basis, or they combine both, so that the Old Testament passage they have quoted is sometimes reproduced in a free version and with new words, that is, only according to the sense. And if the Holy Spirit, in such quotation, transforms the Old Testament Scripture word in form, we may well trust Him that in this He has chosen and set His words with good deliberation, and that in the quotation in question He brings nothing false and contradictory, but always renders the God-intended sense of the Old Testament Scripture. "Surely the Scriptures cannot be broken," John 10:35, His word is truth. F. E. Pasche.

3) *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae* II, 103. 4) *Critica Sacra*, p. 109.
5) *Thesaurus Herm.*, p. 59.

Pauli's traveling companions to Rome.

Among the many companions of Paul on his various journeys are especially: 1. Timothy, who according to Apost. 16, 1 Lhstra called his home, 2. Titus and 3. Luke. In the former it has lately been thought to recognize a brother of Luke, and that he, like the latter, came from Antioch in Syria. "It is possible to take 2 Cor. 12:18 as referring to the brother of Titus. This use of the Greek article is general enough: "I exhorted Titum, and sent with him [his] brother." Possibly the same translation is 2 Cor. 8:18: "his brother." Who is this brother of Titus? One naturally thinks of Luke," writes Robertson in *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research,* p. 13. Also, Luke had not mentioned Titus by name anywhere in Acts precisely because of the relationship. We read something similar in D. Zahn, "Das Evangelium des Lukas" (1920), p. 7 f.: "It can be assumed that Luke joined the apostle at the latest in Troas on Paul's second missionary journey and accompanied him from there to Philippi, but no further. Since several years later, around Easter 58, he accompanied Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem from Philippi to this destination, it seems reasonable to assume that Luke stayed continuously in Philippi during the intervening years and, in addition to his medical profession, was active in matters of mission and church life. To this the old tradition or supposition, that 2 Cor. 8, 18 f. referred to Luke, would be well." To infer so much from the mere article alone is rather daring; D. Schnedermann writes of our passage, "The article will have the simple sense that at the reading of the Epistle the brother stood before the readers." And Meyer renders brother here simply by "fellow Christian."

Further, 4. Tychicus and 5. Trophimus were much about the apostle. According to Apost. 20, 4 they were both native to Asia, that is, western Asia Minor. More exactly, Trophimus was from Ephesus (comp. Apost. 21), and because of the remark of the previous passage (20,4) Tychicus' home was not too far away from Ephesus. 6. Erastus also was a companion of Paul; he has been thought to be connected with Corinth as a home. 7. Demas belongs among Paul's assistants. When he turned his back on the faith, he journeyed to Thessalonica, as Paul tells 2 Tim. 4:10, to indicate that he probably regarded that city as his home. Finally we name 8. Kreszens as a companion of Pauli, who later, as we also read in 2 Tim. 4, 10, moved to Galatia, apparently to be there, because he was quite well known there, to be active for the apostle in the gospel preaching, like Titus in Dalmatia.

During Paul's third missionary journey, that great collection for the poor in Jerusalem was taken by his decree. When it was finally brought there, Apost. 20, 4 Sopater, son of Pyrrhus from Berea, but Aristarchus and Sekundus from Thessalonica, also Gajus from Derbe are mentioned as travel companions at least for this journey, but certainly as accompanying to the final destination Jerusalem. Among all these mentioned are also the travel companions who were around Paul on his involuntary journey to Rome. It is true that the apostle was at that time a Roman prisoner; but if he only paid for the expenses, he was allowed, especially as he enjoyed great popularity with the sub-chief, to have a larger following around him even as a prisoner, if only in view of the place of his interrogation being so far away as witnesses. Others, such as Luke the physician, and Demas, for instance, might have accompanied him, offering themselves to be his slaves.

This imprisonment of Paul, called the first Roman imprisonment as opposed to a later one, lasted from the year 58 until the beginning of 63. The great missionary to the Gentiles was imprisoned in Jerusalem, in Caesarea and in Rome. In the spring of the year 58, around Pentecost, Paul was obviously snatched from an angry mob of Jews by a Roman governor and taken into custody, Apost. 21, 31 ff. On the second following night (cf. 23, 11-31) he was delivered into captivity to the governor Felix in Caesarea for further protection from the fierce Jews. There the apostle sat as a prisoner during the rest of the Jewish biennium (58 and 59 to an end). These were the two short lunar years of the Jewish three-year reckoning of time, with a third year as a leap year. Felix then obtained a more worthy successor in Festus, to whom, however, he left the captive Paul to do the Jews a favor. Festus, a brisk man, sought to bring Paul's trial to an end, Apost. 25, 6 ff. He was, however, prevented from doing so by the latter's appeal to the emperor, wherefore he was obliged to send the surviving prisoner to Rome, that he might there be brought before the emperor's tribunal, Apost. 27, 1. 27, 1. According to Wieseler's investigations, it can hardly be doubted that our active Apostle to the Gentiles got to see Rome for the first time in the spring of 61. (Cf. Meyer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, 1st ed., p. 32.) Thus the Jewish leap year Nisan 60 had passed by then 61, and the apostle now sat the next "whole biennium" indeed in his own Gedinge, but under constant war-servant guard; cf. Apost. 24, 27; 28, 30: διετίας - *διετίαν ,ολην;* against Apost. 19, 10: επί *ετη δύο*. This captivity of our apostle is divided into a Casariensian and a Roman one of more or less equal duration.

Already during the two years of imprisonment in Caesarea some of the companions who came with him from Asia and Europe must have left the apostle's following. History keeps silence about Sopater, Sekundus and Gajus of Derbe. Also Timothy surely (comp. Apost. 20,4) came with him to Jerusalem when the rich tax was delivered there. But then we also hear nothing more about him, except that the letters to Philemon, to the Colossians, and to the Philippians were sent with in his name from the prison at Rome. He was then with Paul in Rome at that time. At one time he had been active in Ephesus for a long time instead of the apostle, but when the latter wrote to the Ephesians from Rome, he did not mention Timothy with a syllable in the letter. So at that time he must not have been around Paul. But in Philippians Paul promised: "I hope in the Lord Jesus that I will soon send Timothy to you", Phil. 2, 19. Paul must have been able to carry this out, so that Timothy was no longer in Rome when the letter to the Ephesians left there. This argumentum e silentio cannot be easily dismissed as a meaningless one.

The New Testament only contains one message about Timothy (except the second letter to him). Hebr. 13, 23 it is written: "Know that the brother Timothy is single again, with whom, if he come quickly, I will see you." This short message contains at least so much information that Timothy had come into closer and certainly not too short contact with the recipients of the letter to the Hebrews. And Hebr. 10, 34 the writer implies that he himself languished or had languished in captivity. As a recipient of the Epistle to the Hebrews, more and more Jewish Christians in the upper Palestine and especially in Syria with the headquarter Antioch are considered. Now when did Timothy have such relations with these Christians, he who as the son of a Jewish woman, but whose father was a Gentile, had been circumcised by the apostle? Let us for once assume as a foregone conclusion-which, to be sure, cannot be done with full certainty-that the Epistle to the Hebrews was conceived by Paul. Then the great apostle to the Gentiles also considered himself responsible to those Jewish Christians. So he also wrote to the Rom er: he had filled everything from Jerusalem and around with the gospel of Christ, Rom. 15, 19. When Paul was imprisoned right after he had brought the great collection, his third missionary journey had come to an abrupt end. But in spite of his imprisonment his eyes were directed to Antioch, just like at the end of his second missionary journey with Timothy. Apart from Timothy, however, he had

no one who was of his own mind like him and who, like him, did not seek his own, but that of Christ Jesus, Phil. 2, 20 f. When he was in the Caesarian captivity and therefore could not be active for the gospel himself, he sent Timothy to Antioch and the surrounding area, who was already well known there and because of his circumcision certainly also well liked there. And in these regions Timothy probably remained active for a long time. Maybe he was still there when Paul was transferred from Caesarea to Rome very quickly.

If one does not go wrong with such possibilities, then Timothy was also not among Paul's travel companions on this crossing to Rome. Dr. John Saul Howson, in *The Companions of Pt. Paul* (American Tract Society, p. 206), seeks to make this probable also: "Nor is Timothy spoken of during the imprisonment at Caesarea, so that we can in no way connect him in our thoughts with Felix and Festus. . . . Again, it seems pretty certain that Timothy was not with Paul during the journey. . . . Neither during the slow journey from Caesarea to Myra nor in the harbor on the south coast of Crete . . . did Luke somehow take the opportunity to mention Timothy. From this it is quite natural to infer that he was not with Paul. But from the [captivity] epistles we see that he soon joined his friend at Rome." Under such conditions, then, it can be understood that soon after his arrival at Rome the next spring, Paul sent for Timothy with words such as we read in 2 Tim. 1:4; 4:9: "I long to see thee. Be diligent to come to me soon." By the way, passages like 2 Tim. 2, 8 point to the spring as the time of writing of the second Epistle to Timothy: "Keep in remembrance Jesus Christ, who is risen from the dead." Similar to this is 2 Tim. 1, 10: "who [Christ] hath taken away the power of death, and hath brought life and an incorruptible nature to light." Such figures of speech, and also already the clause in the Grutz ascription, "Paul, an apostle of JEsu Christ, ... according to the promise of life in Christ JEsu" are evidently allusions to the facts of the time around Easter, allusions which, as a result of our human association of thoughts, have taken their occasion from the time of the writing of the letter; cf. 1 Cor. 5, 7 f.: "For we also have a paschal lamb, that is Christ, sacrificed for us. Therefore let us keep Easter," etc., for which reason D. Schnedermann, in the introduction to this Epistle, remarks: "The season [of the date] may also be determined with a fair degree of certainty: Spring it was, for Pentecost was in some proximity, 1 Cor. 16, 8, and the Jewish Passover was at hand, if not for the readers on receiving the letter, yet for the apostle on writing it." Ver-

same also similar allusions in the Epistle to the Romans, likewise in the greeting Rom. 1, 4, further 4, 14 f.; 6, 4 ff. "The [Epistle to the Romans] is written with the beginning of the spring of 58." (Luthardt.)

Among the other companions of the apostle mentioned above we will probably have to exclude two or three from the traveling party for the crossing, e.g. Aristarchus. It is true that Luke writes Apost. 27,2 concerning the bringing of the captive Paul to Italy about the departure from Caesarea: "But when we entered into an Adramyttian ship, that we should sail to Asia, we sailed from the country; and there was with us Aristarchus of Macedonia, of Thessalonica. " At first glance the words give the impression that Aristarchus was one of Paul's traveling companions as far as Rome. But on looking more closely something strikes one, and one asks: if Paul's travelling companions are to be indicated, why is only Aristarchus mentioned, and why is it told here in such detail, "He was of Macedonia from Thessalonica"? The direction of travel was given as going to Asia Minor, and then Aristarchus' native place, Thessalonica, was mentioned, but the ship was described as an Adramyttian. Adramyttion was not far from Troas, the usual place of passage to Macedonia. If we look closely at the words of the text, we see that Luke mentions the embarkation of Aristarchus to indicate that he also used the Adramyttian ship, but for his journey home to Thessalonica via Troas. A similar passage is found Apost. 18, 18: Paul "wanted to ship in Syria (the destination is also mentioned immediately) and with him Priscilla and Aquila". And yet the two did not travel with him to Syria, but Paul left them behind in Ephesus, v. 19. Accordingly, also in our 27th chapter Aristarchus is not mentioned as Paul's companion to the destination, Rome, but only as a partial fellow traveler. In the spring of the previous year 58 this assistant of the apostle had helped to bring the great collection to Jerusalem (comp. Apost. 20,4), and already ch. 19,29 he is called a "companion of Paul"; so he already belonged to the company of the apostle for some time.

When Titus left with the second letter to the Corinthians, two brothers were sent with him. About one of them we read 2 Cor. 8, 22: "Also we have sent with him our brother, whom we have often felt in many things to be diligent, but now much more diligent." His name is not mentioned. But that the great Apostle to the Gentiles should thus single out this brother, and say nothing more in praise of him, may not be a bad guess as to our Aristarchus, the Macedonian, and therefore European. In the Corinthian passage, according to the context, it is especially about the diligence applied to the great collection. He is also called an apostle or a representative of the church for this purpose. His Europeanism may have contributed to this mission to Europeans, like once

(cf. Apost. 6, 5) for the somewhat overlooked Greek widows in Jerusalem almost only men with Greek names were chosen as almsgivers. And at the final delivery of the collection from Greece, Aristarchus is explicitly remembered as one who took care of it, Apost. 20, 4. 20, 4. But now, a little more than two years later, he returned, if we have understood Apost. 27, 2 correctly, when Paul was taken into Roman custody, he returned to his homeland as one who was at first no longer so much needed for the constant companionship of the apostle. Paul himself, as a prisoner, had to take care of his traveling companions according to the civil law. It must also be remembered that Aristarchus certainly returned to his homeland with the apostle's will in order to give an account of the use of the collected amount in Jerusalem, which probably brought him back to Corinth. Later he sought out the apostle again at Rome; for the Epistle to the Colossians says, "Greetings to you Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner." Evidently he is called here as Rome . 16, 7 Andronicus and Junius and Philem. 23 Epaphras are called fellow-prisoners, namely, in Christ JEsu, or servants of Christ; comp. Col. 4, 12, "Epaphras, a servant of Christ." Paul also sends greetings to Philemon from Aristarchus; cf. Philem. 24.

The other brother, whom Paul sent with Titus from Macedonia to Corinth to finish the collection for Palestine, is characterized like this: "He who has the praise of the gospel through all the churches, not only that, but he is also ordained by the churches to be the companion of our journey in this benefit", 2 Cor. 8, 18 f. D. Zahn, in his introduction to the Gospel of Luke (p. 9), points to Luke; this interpretation already existed in antiquity. However, already in antiquity one also guessed at others. We do not know exactly who it was. However, there seems to be a small trace in the Acts of the Apostles. Because according to Apost. 19, 22 Paul sent two who served him, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia. From 1 Cor. 4, 17 we see that these sends were also designated to Corinth, although only Timothy is mentioned; but Erastus must have been there, because it is the same journey that is mentioned in Acts 19,22. 19,22 is mentioned. Later the apostle met Timothy again and of course also his companion Erastus in Macedonia. And when now also Titus was in a very joyful mood concerning the church in Corinth, Paul sent him and, as already mentioned, two brothers, among whom we assume Erastus to be one, back to Corinth to finish the work of the collection, and this was considered by the churches as co-responsible for this collection work. Finally Paul himself came to Corinth, and after wintering there 57/58 the journey was made to deliver the col-.

lekte to Jerusalem, back through Macedonia, etc. Erastus must have been part of the traveling party, even though he is not mentioned in Apost. 20, 4 he is not mentioned. But the seven mentioned there are mentioned by name, because they went ahead to Troas, cf. v. 5f.: "These went ahead and waited for us at Troas. But we, after the days of Easter, sailed from Philippi unto the fifth day, and came unto them to Troas." Indeed, can we think of the "our," "us" as including only Paul and Luke? It is simply impossible. And which party carried the money with them? The Apost. 20:4 mentioned? And if these, we ask further, had they the whole sum with them? Evidently hardly; for if, in consequence of the deceitful persecutions of the Jews, one part of the collection should be lost, then, after careful consideration, the other part might yet be saved. But should Paul and Luke alone be the "we," and have kept the rest of the money in safekeeping? That is not to be thought of. Therefore we certainly do not miscalculate when we see in the "we" still more persons for the protection of the tax than only Paul and Luke. Erastus had taken part in the collection of the collection, and there is no reason why he should not also have taken part in its delivery. Finally, we are certainly not wrong in assuming that when Paul was brought to Rome as a prisoner in the fall of the year 60, Erastus, like Aristarchus, embarked on the Adramyttian ship and traveled back with it to Macedonia and finally also to Corinth for the purpose of reporting on the use of the tax. In Corinth he also stayed; this is stated in 2 Tim. 4, 20, which seems to imply that Erastus stayed in Corinth, although Paul expected him in Rome and Timothy also assumed that the apostle Erastus was with him in Rome. Timothy thus learned that the latter, as with Demas, Crescens, Titus and others, was not the case.

Among the companions of Paul at the delivery of the tax to Palestine, who were in his entourage on the way from Corinth to Macedonia etc., we must surely include besides Luke also the Thessalonian Demas and perhaps later also the Asia Minor Kreszens. According to the second letter of Timothy, if it was written soon after Paul's arrival in Rome, Demas and Crescens left him there soon, 2 Tim. 4, 10. Timothy was supposed to come to Rome in a hurry because Demas left him out of love for the world and went to Thessalonica and Crescens to Galatia. Demas seems to have taken, so to speak, Timothy's place with Paul, and therefore his relapse into worldliness was all the more painful to the apostle. Luke, and that as personal physician, and Demas may have accompanied Paul on the journey to Rome, as it were.

as his slaves. And if Kreszens was a Asia Minor, he could have been used as a witness against the Asia Minor Jews against Paul. Certain New Testament statements about this are not available.

Who about Tychicus, Trophimus and Titus we still have some scanty information. Who knows the relationship of Paul and Titus can hardly but assume that Titus probably traveled with Paul to Rome. Timothy was on Paul's right hand, Titus on his left in the area of his missionary work. Titus was also at the apostle's disposal for a missionary journey to Dalmatia (2 Tim. 4, 10), obviously to visit the churches that were founded during Paul's third missionary journey in Jllyrikum and to strengthen them in their faith. Also Tychicus was sent from Rome to Ephesus and Colosse (cf. Eph. 6, 21; Col. 4,7), perhaps already in the middle of Paul's imprisonment, obviously to bring news about the apostle's fate during his imprisonment there. Of course this journey of Tychicus cannot be one with the one of which it says 2 Tim. 4, 12: "Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus." But in supposing this we do a sure tread that Tychicus from Caesarea also embarked with the apostle, as did Aristarchus, Erastus, Titus, Trophimus, Crescens, Demas, and Luke. And it cannot be dismissed without further ado if one assumes that, for instance, Tychicus was also sent on from Myra by Paul on the Adramyttian ship with Aristarchus and Erastus during the passage to Rome, namely to Ephesus for the purpose of reporting on the use of that collection and perhaps also for the purpose of levying a new tax for Paul's and his maintenance. For concerning Ephesus news soon came to Rome about Paul's imprisonment, before he sent Tychicus from there to Ephesus and Colosse. We read Eph. 1, 15: "After I have heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus and of your love for all the saints" and 3, 1 f.: "Therefore I, Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus for you Gentiles, after you have heard of the ministry of the grace of God which is given me for you. Through one and the same person, the very Tychicus, since Paul had last seen the Ephesian elders at Miletus, both the Ephesians and Paul may have heard such mutual tidings of each other. Tychicus then apparently traveled later from Ephesus to Rome. And when Paul tells Eph. 6, 21 that he sent Tychicus to them from Rome, "so that you also may know how I am and what I am doing", it is certainly not a wrong reading between the lines, when we recognize Tychicus as the mediator of the previous mutual communication. So we do not have to take Tychicus with us to Rome at once, but

first traveled to Ephesus and then later followed to Rome.

But with Trophimus, the Ephesian, it was different again. After his arrival with Paul in Jerusalem he was seen with him in the city, Apost. 21,29. 21:29, after which there is only the news of him, 2 Tim. 4:20, "But Trophimum I left sick at Mileto." In Paul's company he was when the Roman sub-chief took Paulum prisoner in Jerusalem on account of the tumultuous Jews. As a chief witness for Paul, he must have lingered around the apostle at Caesarea and then safely embarked with him at Caesarea and then also at Myra for the passage to Rome. During the voyage, however, he fell so badly ill that he had to be taken ashore. Perhaps the apostle's surroundings were to learn the lesson: "It is good to trust in the Lord and not to rely on men." This at least served as a preparation for Paul's experience in Rome, of which he says in 2 Tim. 4:16 f.: "In my first responsibility no man stood with me, but they all forsook me. Let it not be imputed to them! But the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me, that through me the preaching might be strengthened, and that all the Gentiles might hear." But where might the sick Trophimus have been brought ashore? First, it cannot be overlooked that Paul makes this communication to Timothy in a personal letter. Timothy was well acquainted with the localities mentioned, and knew that the ships which sailed for Rome in the autumn proceeded under the shelter of the coast of Asia Minor at least as far as Cnidus. Trophimus could be brought to Miletus by a coasting ship trading thence with Miletus. Miletus was probably the next station where Paul knew dear fellow believers to whom he could send the sick Trophimus in order to nurse him back to health with God's help. We are all the more justified in this assumption, since 2 Tim. 4, 20 for "leave behind" is not the compound κατέλιπον, as Apost.
24, 27, and, according to the correct reading, probably also Tit. 1, 5, where it is a question of leaving behind in the case of personal presence in the place. In our passage from Timothy we rather read *ἀπέλιπον*, which is about the
The way and manner of the slackening does not make the certain statement like that other compound. But this lies in the communication to Timothy that Trophimus was no longer among Paul's traveling companions when he finally came to Rome, so that he did not have him around him there now.

If we are not mistaken in this or that assumption in the above, then only these four remained as Paul's travel companions on his involuntary journey to Rome: Crescens, Demas, Luke and Titus, among whom "Luke, the physician, the beloved," remained most constantly around Paul; cf. 2 Tim. 4, 11; Philem. 24; Col. 4, 14.

W. Georgi.

On the Evaluation of the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach.

(Continued.)

We cannot say that the lectures given in Eisenach (as far as they have come to our attention) have brought even a single Lutheran doctrine to the right, contemporary expression. And they are of little value in judging the doctrinal position of the Convention as such, for the very reason that they were not accepted by it, but only listened to and discussed obiter. Their importance was not much more than a purely academic one. Nevertheless, the World Convention was not without practical results. This result is expressed in the unanimously adopted resolutions: the Confession Resolution and the Organization Resolution. The former reads: "The Lutheran World Convention confesses the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the sole source and infallible norm of all church teaching and action, and regards the Confession of the Lutheran Church, especially the unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, as the fair rendering of the Word of God."

How this sentence is to be judged depends, of course, not only on the wording of it, but also on the historical context from which it emerged. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the doctrine of the infallibility of the whole of Holy Scripture was still regarded as a self-evident common property of all Christendom, and when no sophistries and Machiavellian arts were yet known with regard to the obligation to confess, there would have been little to criticize about the Eisenach formula. Even in the mouths of the founders of our Synod, who were all known as people wholeheartedly devoted to the doctrine of the literal inspiration of Holy Scripture and sincere in their commitment to the symbols, the Eisenach resolution would have been considered an orthodox confession. In the light of its historical context, however, this in itself innocuous sentence takes on a different face. In this context the unanimous adoption of the same means nothing less than actual denial of the very truths which, according to the circumstances, should and ought to have been confessed loudly and decisively at Eisenach. Not what it says as such, but what it does not say, what it conceals, but should have said according to the prevailing circumstances and confessed to the errors prevailing at Eisenach, that is what gives the confessional resolution the stamp of a compromise, an actual "We agree to differ."

Next to the question: How do you think of Christ and his work of reconciliation? stands today, as never before in the history of the church, the question: How do you think of Christ and his work of reconciliation?

others in the foreground of religious and ecclesiastical interest: What do you think of the Holy Scriptures? Is it, in all its parts, the inerrant Word of God, inspired by the Holy Spirit? All faithful Christians stand here on the side of Christ, with whom they confess, "The Scriptures cannot be broken!" This conviction was and is also the self-evident premise and clear teaching of Luther and all the Lutheran confessions. Whoever abandons this position leaves the Lutheran ground.

In Christianity today, however, as is well known, the voices of those who contradict Christ to his face are becoming ever more numerous and louder. Even within the Lutheran Church, the majority of all theologians, including positive and confessional ones, have long asserted: Scripture is neither inspired nor free from error in all its parts. Already Walther had reason to complain that modern Lutheran (scientific) theologians, "as it seems almost without exception," declared Scripture to be a book in many cases in error. Whoever, therefore, has to speak today about Holy Scripture must show his colors with reference to its inspiration and infallibility. To be silent here is to deny. To refuse to confess with Christ is nothing other than to refuse to agree with him, to contradict him.

Now what about the Eisenach Confession Resolution? Does it express the truth of the infallibility of the whole of Holy Scripture fully, clearly, and in keeping with the times? Certainly, it describes Scripture as the "only source and infallible norm of all church teaching and action. But it avoids the real point at issue here. Whether all Scripture is inspired by the Holy Spirit and free from error in all its parts, the resolution says nothing about. According to the general experience of today, however, theologians who do not want to answer this question are among those who deny the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. Why did they not confess color at Eisenach?

There was no lack of an attempt to move the Convention to a right, contemporary declaration with reference to Scripture. (Cf. L. u. W. 1923, p. 362.) But it remained a futile effort. With very few exceptions, as everyone knew, the Eisenach delegates were all on the side of the moderns in this play. In the reports it is said that it would have been impossible to bring the verbal inspiration and complete infallibility of the Holy Scriptures to recognition on the part of the Convention. So the confession of the same was deliberately circumvented and rejected in Eisenach.

This fact would have been a reason for us, had we been represented at the World Convention, to withhold our assent in the joint adoption of the above resolution. For Harm-

Whatever the formula may be in itself, in its historical context the common acceptance of it means nothing less than a denial of the full Lutheran truth of Scripture. In the light of its origin, the Eisenach resolution is at the same time a public declaration that the Lutheran World Convention, not only in the majority of its members, but also as such, did not wish to confess the acceptance of the literal inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture, nor did it consider such a confession necessary for ecclesiastical unity. To have mistrusted it here at Eisenach would have been tantamount to denying all the truths involved. The clearer it was that the inerrancy of Scripture was rejected by almost all the delegates, with Ihmels at their head, and that even the Convention as such did not want a confession of the same, the more decidedly we should have demanded its acceptance and refused our consent to any substitute.

According to the Eisenach Resolution, Scripture is "the sole source and infallible norm of all ecclesiastical teaching and action". Without the assumption of the inerrancy of the whole of Holy Scripture, however, this resolution lacks the terra firma, the foundation on which alone it can stand. Without it, the resolution floats in the air. Scripture can be the infallible norm of ecclesiastical teaching only if it is inspired and free of error in all its parts. It is the first only by virtue of the second. If the second falls, so does the first. In the mouths of the delegates to the Convention, who rejected the confession of the infallibility of the whole of Holy Scripture, the resolution thus descends to a groundless, arbitrary assertion.

Whether this might have come to the clear consciousness of the delegates of the World Convention? Did they really believe that they could reject the infallibility and true inspiration of Scripture and yet at the same time accept and uphold the Eisenach Confession resolution (that Scripture is "the sole source and infallible norm of all church teaching and action")? We confess that while reading the resolution the thought repeatedly occurred to us whether the delegates were really in earnest with this declaration of theirs. He who with clear consciousness rejects the sole reason for a certain consequence cannot seriously want that consequence himself. He who denies the inerrancy of Scripture with clear consciousness and determination, as was the case with the great majority of the representatives of the World Convention, has hardly any right to claim that he is taken seriously and given full confidence when he calls Scripture "the only source and infallible norm of all ecclesiastical teaching and action. Even some of the theologians represented in Eisenach openly admit that they do not draw their theology from Scripture,

not be founded on Scripture and not be standardized by Scripture.

However this may be subjectively, on what will the World Convention objectively base its resolution, if it does not want to know anything about the absolutely necessary supersentence: Scripture cannot be broken; everything that is written in it is true? If this, which Scripture itself clearly teaches, is not valid, how and with what will the World Convention then prove that Scripture is infallible in matters of faith and life? In any case, the word of Scripture can no longer be used to show that it is infallible in any matter, if the biblical passages which teach the absolute infallibility of the whole of Scripture are not accepted. If the Bible is not reliable in all its statements, one is no longer justified in accepting any of its propositions unconditionally on their mere word, least of all statements concerning faith and life. By denying the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, the delegates in Eisenach have themselves knocked out the bottom of their confessional resolution.

If the Scriptures are not literally inspired, and therefore in all their parts infallible words of God, we can (for the reason that the Scriptures say so, as Christ and the apostles did) no longer believe anything at all of them, and hold them to be divinely certain. "It is written"-this majestic word, which decides everything in the Christian Church, then no longer conceals anything. Modern theological science has taken away its power, as Luther once did from the Pope's banishing ray, which was feared in the Middle Ages. With the verbal inspiration the a priori certainty of Scripture falls, which can then be restored by nothing at all. Behind every statement of Scripture the question mark creeps in: Is it true? Should God really have said it? As with every other book, we must always be on our guard when reading the Bible, lest we approve the false and reject the true, keep the chaff and throw away the wheat.

When it comes to questions concerning our eternal weal and woe, we need a book that can be trusted absolutely, that gives us absolutely reliable information, and that victoriously overcomes all doubts and temptations within us. In the Scriptures the Church believes she possesses such a book. But if the verbal inspiration falls, the Scriptures, their authority and divine certainty are lost. And Bible lost, all lost! There is then no reliable answer to the most important of all questions. The sun has lost its light; the stars are extinguished. We sink back into pagan night and darkness. Skepticism waves its scepter. Subjectivism...

mus takes the throne. Everything is ruled by delusion. Everyone believes what he lets himself dream.

If the Scriptures are not everywhere reliable in every statement, no one can any longer know and say in what places and in what matters they deserve to be trusted. A Christian can then no longer learn from his Bible what he is to believe, teach, and confess, and which are the false doctrines he must guard against, and the false prophets he must flee and avoid, as dear as his blessedness is to him. No one can cry out more: "According to the law and testimony," according to the Holy Scriptures - which point the right way in life and death! Yes, even at the hour of death, no one will be able to give assurance with reference to any of the comforting words of Scripture: This word is certain divine truth, in which you can safely trust and build, a rod that will not break you, even in the dark valley.

If the Scriptures are not literally inspired and absolutely free from error, there is no longer any source for theologians or for ordinary Christians to draw with certainty any Christian doctrine of faith; no longer any proof by which they can establish any Christian doctrine and prove it to be true; no longer any touchstone to distinguish truth from error. In our Christian faith there is then no longer any article of which we could still confess with real conviction, "It is certainly true!" There is then no longer a single proposition which could still be regarded as Christian dogma and universally valid church doctrine. All Christian faith, and all the more so all common Christian faith, is deprived of its ground. It becomes an obsolete, untrue phrase when we still sing, "We all believe in one God," or declare in our confession: We believe, teach, and confess with one accord. There is then nothing at all left to believe with divine certainty and to confess with one accord with all Christendom.

According to our confession, the Scriptures are "the pure, clean fountain of Israel" and the "only rule and guide by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged and discerned". But it can only be so if it is in all its parts the literally inspired and inerrant Word of God. If it is not, we need another higher, extra-biblical standard by which to decide which threads in the fabric of thought of Scripture are genuine and which are not, what is divine revelation and what is human addition, what is true and what is false, what we are to accept from it and what we are to reject. It is not Scripture, not the word of Scripture which is clear according to text and context, but this extra-biblical authority, which is decisive over Scripture, that is then the real final standard of faith and life. It is it according to which we

have to examine the Scriptures and their teachings and possibly correct and reject them.

Whatever one may then call the higher court to which Scripture is to be subjected - be it the "infallible" Pope, the Church, reason, science, the Christian ego, or experience - the Lutheran principle of Scripture and the whole theology and doctrine of Scripture set with it are lost.*) One can then no longer turn to Scripture, as has hitherto been the case.

---

*) Guhmann, as we have already communicated in "Lehre und Wehre" (p. 94), in response to the call made at Eisenach by the Americans to the German theologians to return to the doctrine of the literal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, declared "roundly and clearly": "We cannot turn the wheel of history backwards." With the same candor, Guhmann states, "A theology of Scripture, such as the Americans cultivate, based on the fundamental premise of verbal inspiration, is not at all present in Germany." But what this means for theology and the individual doctrines of it is shown by the following statement of D. Münkel, quoted by D. Pieper in his Dogmatik (1, 151): "There is hardly a doctrine left which has not undergone transformation, additions, and eradications to a considerable extent. One starts from the Trinity, "before going on to the doctrines of the person and the work of Christ, of faith and righteousness, of the sacraments and the church, up to the last things, one will hardly find anything left in its old form and in its former value. Not infrequently it is so changed that only the old frame still reminds one of the old picture, and sometimes even the frame is smashed as even too scarce and old Frankish. A small sample may illustrate this. If, according to the doctrine of the Church, Christ is truly God even in His lowliness, He has now been emptied of the divine attributes without which deity cannot be thought at all, or His deity is allowed to be gradually worked into Him until the resurrection. The death of Christ has had to put up with the fact that it was no longer done to make atonement in our stead and to reconcile us to God. The righteousness of faith by God's declaration of righteousness is said to be too wooden and external; in a somewhat obscured manner, works are again drawn upon. Law and gospel are again mixed together. The Word of God and preaching are put aside as if the sacraments had to do the main thing, or at any rate had to bring life into the church first. The visible church is again given such importance as if it were the true church, the holder of all God's promises. And what shall I say about the relation of the churches, of office and regiment, of chiliasm and eternal life?... I suppose if we were to agree on all these deviations and changes, whether enumerated or not, could this still be called Lutheran doctrine, or would one have the courage to call that the continuation of Lutheran doctrine, which sweeps out the most essential pieces of Lutheran doctrine like old rubble? I, at least, would not have the heart to call myself a Lutheran, and would frankly confess: We have all deviated." Such was Münkel's judgment, not of the Free Protestants and Neo-Rationalists, but of the so-called "confessional Lutheran" theologians at Erlangen and Leipzig, who had abandoned the inerrancy of Scripture, and with it the Lutheran principle of Scripture, and then set to work to remodel and develop the Christian doctrines according to their new principle of experience. It was the year 1862 when Münkel wrote the above. And since then it has been

all faithful Lutherans have done, as the sole infallible standard of faith, life, teaching, and confession, and no longer allow it to be valid as the pure source of truth in every respect, or, as our confession says, "ut limpidissimos purissimosque Israelis fontes". Our confessions, which are valid only if the Scriptures are valid, our catechisms and hymn books, etc.-we can cash them all in if the Scriptures are not the truly inspired, inerrant Word of God. The dam is punctured, and the all-swamping floods of modern liberalism can no longer be held back.

In short, without the presupposition rejected by the World Convention, namely, that the whole of Holy Scripture is God's infallible Word, the Eisenach Resolution collapses in on itself. If the Bible is a source in which truth and untruth are mixed together, if it is like a yardstick that measures sometimes right and sometimes wrong, it cannot possibly be regarded as the sole source and infallible norm of church teaching and life. The old axiom of Scripture, "According to law and testimony," then no longer has any validity. Scripture has lost its significance for theology and the church. It is reduced to an unreliable book, full of errors, which can no longer serve us as a theological principle of knowledge, or even as a norma normata. No, as things stood in Eisenach, we could not have adopted the confession resolution together with the representatives of the World Convention.

Perhaps, however, someone will object that the Confession Resolution does not reject the verbal inspiration, and that we in Eisenach were therefore at liberty to base the sentence on the presupposition we considered necessary for our own person, and

---

in this regard has not improved even among the positives. The debate on verbal inspiration quoted above took place several months ago, and Gußniann is considered a conservative, confessional theologian. His attack on verbal inspiration appeared in the organ of the Lutheran Federation. How now Gußmann judges of theology and its doctrine is shown by such pronouncements as the following: There is no such thing as a Lutheran standard theology; in truth, theology is a changing quantity; its task is an infinite one, which it is always able to master only approximately in ever new attempts; Whoever, therefore, would fix it at any stage of its historical development, would condemn it to a standstill, and thereby at the same time cut its very lifeline, the never resting, undauntedly pressing forward work; theological doctrinal contradictions are something quite inevitable; we must accept them as given, and may even rejoice in them as a part of our spiritual riches. (Cf. L. u. W. 1924, 95 f.) According to the conservative and confessional Gußmann (perhaps also according to the Lutheran League?), then, there can be no question at all of a universally valid theology with fixed, definite doctrines. And Gußmann would be right if the word of Christ: "The Scripture cannot be broken" were no longer valid and the Scripture were really, as the moderns all want, an inerrant book.

from this to give him our consent. We answer: This would have been impossible, because under the present circumstances we would have actually denied the doctrine of the infallibility of the Holy Scriptures and would have declared the confession of the same to be unnecessary for Christian unity. For this reason, too, we could not have voted for the confessional resolution together with the delegates of the World Convention, because we would thereby have created the untrue appearance before all the world that we were in agreement concerning the doctrine of Scripture with the theologians who deny inspiration and infallibility, or who consider such denials to be harmless, trivial. In fact, the unanimous adoption of the Confession Resolution has also been interpreted and exploited in this way. Notwithstanding the generally known fact that literal inspiration is firmly denied by the great majority of the delegates, it has been inferred from the resolution that the position of the World Convention on Scripture is an irreproachable one. Thus, for example, D. Knubel, who was not unacquainted with the state of affairs at Eisenach, has declared with reference to the resolution: "The Conference recorded its unfaltering devotion to the Word of God and the Confessions of the Church." But does not this mean misleading Christendom, to speak of "unfaltering devotion to the Word of God" in the case of delegates who declare the Scriptures to be an erroneous book, and in the case of a Convention which will not confess with Christ, "The Scriptures cannot be broken" ? Among the prominent members of the World Convention was Söderblom. Shall what Knubel says of "unfaltering devotion to the Word of God" apply also with reference to him? Had we been represented at Eisenach, we would have considered it our duty to bear decided testimony to the verbal inspiration, and we would have felt the approval of a confessional statement which bypassed it as a weakening of our testimony, as an actual concession that, after all, one can also send oneself into it if this truth is denied and not confessed. F. B.

(Conclusion follows.)

"Theses on the Right Relationship of an Evangelical Lutheran Christian to the Local Free School System."

Under this heading, J. H. Fick presented twenty-one sentences to the Western District of our Synod assembled in Addison, III, in 1870, some of which were briefly discussed by the Synod up to the eleventh thesis. In the interest of our school system, we are reprinting them here at the request of several, while at the same time following them with several passages from the debates recorded by Father Biewend. The theses are as follows:

"I. There are in the world three holy estates or communities, instituted by God himself: the nourishing estate, the teaching estate, and the military estate, or family, church, and state. II. As the marriage state remains God's foundation even in the heathen, so the state is and remains God's order even when composed of heathen, false believers, and apostates. III. As distinguished from the Church, the power of the State extends only over temporal goods; the means by which it is governed is the natural light of reason, and its supreme end is the temporal welfare of its citizens. IV. Since morality is the foundation of all state welfare, the state must not give citizenship to anyone who denies the truth of natural religion, namely, the existence of God, the binding force of the moral law, and retribution after death. V. The State as such has no business to make its citizens pious and blessed. VI. There can be no Christian State in the strict sense of the word. VII. a State which proclaims freedom of religion is not therefore an anti-Christian State. VIII. A Christian State in a certain sense of the word is one which by some official act professes the Christian religion. IX. Where there is separation of Church and State, and freedom of religion, it is sinful for any party to seek by unlawful means to elevate its denomination to the status of State religion, or to give it precedence. X. The state can only achieve its purpose, the general temporal welfare of its citizens, if they have the necessary education. XI. It is the duty of parents and the Church to provide for the elementary and religious instruction of children. XII. It is unfortunately a manifest fact that the parents and the churches, which aspire to be Christian churches, have for the most part neglected this duty in this country. XIII. The sad consequence of this is the prevalent de-Christianization and de-moralization of the masses. XIV. Since parents and the Church either cannot or will not perform their duty to the children, the establishment and maintenance of the free school system here is a political necessity in order to provide the citizens with the necessary human education. XV. Since God's Word commands Christians to bear the burdens of the state and to be obedient to its laws, Lutheran Christians are obligated to willingly pay the taxes imposed upon them by the state for its schools. XVI. It is to be considered a gracious divine providence if the reading of the Bible is still permitted by law in the State schools. XVII. Where Lutherans can do so according to the laws, it is their duty to work so that the Bible is not banned from the free schools. To the extent that Lutherans have political influence over the free schools, they should see to it that: 1. Christian-minded persons are appointed to teach in the free schools, i.e., as the state laws already forbid, no atheists or other persons of notorious Christianity should be appointed to teach in the free schools.

2. that the teachers do not put forward anything, nor do the textbooks contain anything, that is contrary to the truth of the natural or Christian religion; 3. that good outward discipline is practiced in them. It would be irresponsible conscientiousness on the part of Lutheran parents to send their children to the local free schools before they have been confirmed in the knowledge of the pure doctrine and in the faith, for the following reasons: 1. because no orthodox religious instruction may be given in the local free schools. 2. 2. even though the Bible may be read in the free schools, this is by no means a substitute for formal religious instruction. (3) Far from prayer, if permitted in the free schools, being of any value to them, it is precisely prayer, as it is mostly practiced by false and unbelievers, that brings great danger to the souls of the children. (4) Even in the teaching of history, geography, and other subjects, poison of the soul may be instilled into the children, and unfortunately this does happen, as experience teaches. (5) The textbooks in use in the local free schools contain, without exception, the leaven of false doctrine. (6) The discipline practiced in the free schools is almost always unchristian and very pernicious, because it is sometimes too lax, sometimes too strict, and knows almost no other means of achieving diligence and good conduct than cursed ambition, or spurring the children on to zeal in learning by other sinful motives. (7) Since Lutheran children in the free schools easily enter into the most intimate fellowship with such children as are already completely depraved, they are thereby plunged into the utmost danger of being filled with a false spirit and seduced to false doctrine, unbelief, and vice, because the antidote of Christian discipline is lacking here. (8) Supposing the children made the greatest progress in all the knowledge taught in the free schools, even the highest formal education cannot sanctify and improve a man morally, and the benefit of such progress is only temporal, and therefore, according to God's word, only a comparatively very small one, and by no means a substitute for the unspeakable harm to the soul which they can do therein. (9) By attending the free schools, the shyness of false teachers and the love for their Evangelical Lutheran mother church are killed in the children. For this reason Lutheran Christians, who know how serious and difficult the account is which they will have to give on the Last Day concerning their children, cannot leave them to the free schools for education and instruction as long as they are not yet firmly established in knowledge and faith. XXI. It is equally dangerous, and altogether to be disapproved of, when orthodox congregations, instead of establishing their own denominational schools, seek to satisfy their need of schooling by the use of the public schools in any way."

In the comments on the ninth thesis it says about the great blessing of our parochial schools: "Our parochial schools are the crown and hope of our church. Through them the firm and sound doctrine of the Word of God, Lutheranism, is implanted in the children. Without parochial schools we would easily become a mobile sect, driven to and fro by the wind of false doctrine. In our schools, pure doctrine is instilled in the child, as it were, with his mother's milk, and even young children feel here that they are members of our church. If we do not value and esteem the blessing that our church schools bring, God will take it from us and give it to others. Let us remember how many of the pastors and teachers now in office among us have come out of our parochial schools, whom we would not have if we had lacked these parochial schools. And how many are being led back to Christ through our preachers and teachers!"

With reference to the duty of parents and the Church to provide for the Christian education of children, we read in the eleventh thesis: "That parents have the duty to provide for the religious education of their children, the Scripture says when it exhorts parents in Eph. 6:4: 'Raise them [children] in discipline and admonition to the Lord. In order that the children may be brought up in a Christian way, schools are necessary in which the children are taught the way to salvation and a Christian education takes place. Deut. 6:4, 5 says: "And these words, which I command thee this day, thou shalt take to heart, and shalt sharpen them unto thy children, and speak of them, when thou sittest in thine house, or walkest by the way, when thou liest down, or risest up."' This word of God is still binding upon us today, for it does not belong to the Jewish ceremonial law, but to the moral law. Gen. 18:17, 19, we are told of Abraham's bringing up children. Abraham, however, is a father and model of the faithful; therefore all who wish to be Christians must also follow his example in this. - That the church also has a duty to provide for the godly education of children, or rather for the religious instruction of children, is likewise testified to in the Holy Scripture Jn. 21:15, where Christ says to Peter, "Feed my lambs," and later says, in distinction, "Feed my sheep. Now since no word is written in vain in Scripture, it is certainly God's will that the children also should be fed in and with God's Word. Our symbols also testify to this in many places. Parents also have the duty to care for the elementary education of their children. This can be seen from 1 Tim. 6:8, where it says, "But if any man provide not for his own, and especially for his household, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than a heathen."' But caring for the children does not only mean that they are given the

The first is to provide them not only with the necessary means of subsistence, but also with that degree of education by which they will be enabled, when they are grown up, to acquire the necessary means of subsistence for themselves. Luther also points out that once the ancient heathen provided for the most careful instruction of their children, and that therefore we Christians are all the more indebted to do the same."

Finally, the concluding thoughts warn against the religionless state schools, which, at bottom, are nothing but "heathen schools," as follows: "From all this (the theses together with their explanations) Christians will easily be able to see how they are to relate to the public schools. Taken as a whole, these are heathen schools, in the best case such, in which no manifest ungodliness is taught, but neither is the pure doctrine of the Word of God taught, nor may it be taught. Therefore smaller children should only be sent to district schools, even in extreme emergencies, when it is certain that the teacher is not an unbeliever or a false believer, and that a church school is out of reach. If, according to 2 Cor. 12:14, parents are to gather treasures for their children - and certainly those are meant here which will not be eaten by moths or rust, that is, treasures of eternal life - then they must certainly not send their children to such schools where these treasures are not only not given to them, but where there is danger enough that they will be taken from them. One cannot imagine the danger our children are in if the school they attend teaches unchristian doctrine, teaches from unchristian books, and does not practice Christian discipline. How careful parents would be to give their children poisoned bread, however small a piece it might be! But how much more should they beware and watch that their children are not taught any poison of the soul, even the slightest. If no Lutheran parochial school can be obtained, parents should teach their children themselves; for this is properly and originally the duty of parents. In apostolic times grandmothers and old women did it, as may be seen from Tit. 2:3, where old women are said to be "good teachers. When parents give their children to unbelieving teachers, God often takes them from them, or they perish, and will then appear on Judgment Day as accusers against their unfaithful parents. Such church members who do not want to act according to the word of God in this matter are to be taken into church discipline. As for children who are already more firmly grounded in the knowledge of the Lutheran doctrine and in a Christian walk, which is to be expected only after confirmation, it may be left to the discretion of the parents to send them for a time to the public schools for further training in English, just as a son may under certain circumstances be sent to a school of English.

unbelieving (if otherwise morally respectable) teacher into apprenticeship."

The situation around 1870 with regard to Bible reading in the state schools of our country, to which several theses (XVI and XVII) refer, is not completely clear to us. But even today we as Christians would not consider ourselves obliged to throw ourselves into the harness with special zeal for the abolition or against the introduction of Bible reading in state schools. Possibly, after all, there might be a blessing in it, and through such use in schools, for example, the Bible might also enter some homes. On the other hand, as citizens of a country that has written religious freedom and equality on its banner, we could not be happy to advocate that fellow citizens (papists, Jews, etc.) who protest on religious grounds against the use of the Bible, or rather the New Testament, in the state schools, should be taxed for such schools or even be forced to have their children participate in such Bible reading. F. B.

Literature.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo, has published:

1. ***The Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans A.. D. 10.*** **From the Narrative of Josephus, as Retold by** ***Dean Milman*** **in His** ***History of the Jews.*** **By** ***L. H. Becker.*** 70 pp. 55 Cts. - The account of the destruction of Jerusalem, as it is found, for example, in our German hymnal, has always been read with interest, and was formerly read publicly in some churches. It contains, after all, the literal fulfillment of Christ's prophecy concerning the unhappy city, which did not consider what served for its peace. We doubt not that many hands will now reach for this English edition.

2. ***Statistical Year-Book of*** **the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States for the Year 1923.** 217 pages, $1.00 net. - We know of no statistical year-book of any synod which would give such comprehensive and reliable information as that of the Missouri Synod, prepared by L. E. Eckhardt. F. B.

Commentary on the Letter of Paul to the Romans. By D. G. Stoeckhardt, professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. **Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.** $3.50.

To characterize this splendid commentary, which first made its appearance in 1907, may follow here some passages from the preface. "The Epistle to the Romans," begins D. Stöckhardt, "is acknowledged to be the most distinguished doctrinal writing of the New Testament. And so, in interpreting it, it is surely the chief task of the exegete to bring out its doctrinal content. This, of course, is not possible without a close study of the biblical text and context. In the present work, the undersigned has endeavored first of all to do justice to the linguistic side of the letter, and then, above all, to make himself and the readers properly aware of the eternal, divine thoughts which have been expressed in the apostolic epistle. The purely historical interest with which some recent exegetes treat biblical books and especially the letters of the apostles must not be allowed to claim the glory of special scholarship. Every scripture wants to be judged according to its peculiarity and according to its tendency. And which is the tendency of the sacred writings is self-evident, and is clearly attested by Paul 2 Tim. 3, 16."

The method followed in this commentary is that of "continuous, coherent explanation and development". Stöckhardt remarks: "In the so-called glofsatory method, which attaches linguistic and factual remarks to individual textual components, one easily loses the train of thought and the coherence of thought. If, on the other hand, as is done in some recent commentaries, the grammatical, lexical, historical, and archaeological material is treated in notes, and the actual exegetical exposition is limited to a free reproduction of the contents of the letter, what belongs together closely, language and matter, form and content, are pulled apart. The biblical text is, after all, the given quantity here and must always remain the focus of consideration. It is the task of interpretation to ascertain meaning and content from the words that are written there. Thus the interpretation must not hover over the text like an independent intellectual product. To our knowledge, no interpreter has ever succeeded in completely eliminating linguistic discussion from the coherent development of thought. In this case, the exegete must anxiously weigh how much of the linguistic matter he wants to include in the text of the interpretation, how much he wants to refer to in the notes. And the reader is compelled to look out and down continually." There is not a single footnote in the entire commentary; everything is woven into the text, making for easy and enjoyable reading.

As far as the history of interpretation is concerned, Stöckhardt first refers to Zahn's remark that no commentary offers enough space to discuss all previous interpretations, but that today's commentator must present to his readers everything that has been contributed over the centuries to clarify the biblical text. Then he continues: "In our commentary we have tried to identify as misinterpretations all those interpretations which alter the meaning of an important passage and thus the teaching of Paul; on the other hand, we have allowed old and new commentators to speak for themselves where they have once expressed and clarified the apostle's opinion in a particularly accurate manner. The fact that Luther again brought Paul's Gospel out of the plan, and opened to Christianity the very understanding of the central doctrine of justification, justifies our making more extensive use of the testimonies of the Reformation age than is usually done in more recent commentaries."

It is a scientific commentary in the best sense of the word, which is offered here - scientific, because especially with the doctrinal texts it is shown in a careful, thorough way logically and grammatically that they cannot merely teach what is taken from them, but that text and context force exactly this and express only this and nothing else. Stöckhardt's commentary is unquestionably among the best that has been written about the Epistle to Rome. Many hands have reached for it, so that for years the first strong edition has disappeared from the market. Therefore, now that it is available again, may especially our younger pastors make it the object of serious study. We say "serious study", for a commentary such as the one offered here does not merely want to be read occasionally, but to be thought through, inwardly appropriated, and, as it were, personally lived through in continuous work. F. B.

From Advent to Advent. Sermons on Free Texts. By the *Rev. L. Buchheimer*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 354 pp. H2 50.

This collection offers 58 sermons. The samples we have read (e.g. First Sunday in Advent, Second Sunday in Advent, Christmas Day, Fifth Sunday in Lent, Easter Sunday) are all distinguished not only by sound, doctrinal content, but also by beautiful, appealing form. Each is performed like a building in noble style from the everlasting material of Holy Scripture. May they find many readers and bring much blessing! F. B.

The Old Testament in the Classroom. A contribution to a religious-national education of the people. By D. Friedrich Niebergall, Professor in Marburg. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. M. 2.

Niebergall wants to show here how the Old Testament is to be used in teaching in the interest of a "religious-ethical personalism". Discussed are the primal stories, the patriarchs, the conquest of the Promised Land,

the judges, Israel's royal period, the prophets and the doctrinal writings (the Book of Jonah and Job). The presuppositions Niebergall is guided by show, among others, the following omissions: "The language of all unformed religion is poetry, myth, and legend." This is also true of the Old Testament. "Holy ignorance has made of it literal accounts of real events, and erected a law for belief. Hence so much disaster and devastation to souls and consciences. All this is of no avail: there must be a thorough break with the previous way of mediating and covering up. The consideration of superiors and parents must no longer stand in the way of truth. . . . It is best if [in lessons] the stories are treated twice. They should also be told to the lower classes in the same way as fairy tales are told and, where possible, the fairy tale quality should be heightened. Or add: "This is how the ancient Israelites told themselves how the world was created. Every question, of course, whether this and that is really true, must not be answered in the affirmative, nor evasively; it must be answered truthfully. Later, in the second treatment, one must tell the truth."

In 1921, 625 teachers in Prussia refused to teach religion, and in Saxony the number was even greater. What interest could even a teacher have in religious instruction if it is to be given in Niebergall's sense? No one has brought more ruin and desolation upon Germany than her liberal university theologians - these most useless and harmful of all men, who build nothing, promote nothing, erect nothing, strengthen nothing, but always destroy and tear down. F. B.

The Protestant religious education in the light of the pedagogical aspirations of the present. At the same time a short teaching of methods. By D. Heinrich Matthes. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. M. 1.20.

This paper seeks to show that religious instruction must not place the emphasis one-sidedly on the intellect, but must also influence the will and especially the feeling and the mind, so as to have the effect that the Christian truths, also those of the second and third articles, are really experienced by the pupil.

The following interesting statement, among others, testifies to the spirit in which the author treats his subject: "If education takes place through school life, it follows that this school life can have the best educational effect if it is filled with a unified spirit. This point of view speaks in principle for the purely Protestant school, because in it the Protestant-Christian spirit can have its effect uninhibited by considerations. For the effect of the spirit of education depends on its working through the whole life of the school. First of all through the whole teaching. Experience teaches that religious instruction is most successful when it is given by the class teacher, who also teaches in the other subjects and expresses the same religious conviction there as in the religious lesson, but that the subject-teacher system is one of the reasons for the lack of effect of religious instruction in the higher schools. How beautiful it is to speak of Luther in the history lesson, of Father Gerhardt in the German lesson, as well as in the religion lesson; how beautiful to rehearse the chorales in the singing lesson, and in the biology lesson to speak of the working of God's love in nature; how beautiful the opening of the morning lessons with chorale singing and prayer! In purely Protestant schools, however, it is also possible to order the children's living together in a Protestant-Christian spirit and to permeate the school with the warm Christian spirit of life through which, for example, the Herrnhut educational institutions are so popular." This goal, however, can obviously only be achieved in parochial schools, such as we have in America, in which all teachers are heartily devoted to the Lutheran confession and all teaching and educating is done in the same Lutheran spirit.

In America, too, in a hysterical effort to stem somewhat the still rising tide of crime, some have advocated religionless moral instruction in the public schools. Matthes judges of such an endeavor, as follows: "The call for pure moral instruction already suffers from the great defect that it is impossible to determine what morality is, and that the determination of its content is as different as that of the various

The following are the world views underlying the moral systems: Jewish morality (cf. its conception of the neighbor as a fellow human being and its exclusion of the enemy as an object of love for the neighbor, Matth. 5, 43); Catholic morality (cf. the recommendation of monasticism); Protestant morality (cf. the estimation of work in the civil profession as worship); Buddhist morality (cf. the killing of the thirst for life); Nietzsche's "Herrenmoral" (morality of the master)." Here in America, at any rate, such moral instruction would have to be limited to those things frowned upon in the laws of the land and of the state.

In addition to the differences in the outward works mentioned by Matthes, there are the inner differences in the motives that determine the actual character of a work. A work is only truly moral when it flows from faith in forgiveness for Christ's sake and from the motives set by such faith. Any other motive spoils the flower even of the otherwise noblest and outwardly most blameless work. It lacks the sweet odor pleasing to God. The author writes: "From the fact that this properly Christian motive to moral walk is so foreign to many, and that in public discussions of the question of the necessity of religion for the justification of morality one thinks almost only of the fear of divine punishment and of the hope of divine reward in this world and in the hereafter , the Christian preaching is itself to blame, because it itself got too much stuck in the Old Testament justification of morality [the Old Testament knows no other justification of true, "God-pleasing" morality than the New Testament, namely, the atonement through Christ and faith in the same] and scriptural words like 2 Cor. 5, 14. 15, which describe the moral effect of Christ's death, belong more or less to the "sleeping words of God."" Where the preaching of Christ's beneficence falls silent, however, the fountain of true good works is stopped up, because real willingness to do good can then no longer come about. Without a free, spontaneous good will, unconstrained in every respect, there is no true morality. But what makes sinners really willing is and can only be gratitude for the grace obtained in Christ, the all-forgiving grace which leaves nothing for us to earn and nothing to fear. Unfortunately, however, this truth has long belonged to the "sleeping" truths and words of God in the Christian world at large. In this connection the author reminds us of the beautiful words of Paul Gerhardt in his will to his son: "Do good to people, even though they do not have to repay you; for what men do not have to repay, the Lord has long since repaid, since he created you, since he gave you his dear Son and adopted you as his child."

Matthes describes the rote learning of catechism, Bible verses and songs, which was outlawed by many pedagogues, as "an exercise which, despite being so fiercely opposed, is still defended and highly esteemed, not only by theologians, but also by very free-thinking people, such as Hebbel". (17.) The author also recalls that the psychologist Wundt, when asked if he agreed with the elimination of the Ten Commandments from the classroom, replied: that was to be called cultural barbarism.

One will not agree with everything that is presented in this book, not even with everything that is purely pedagogical. But whoever reads critically will learn from it. F. B.

Vademecum for prospective theologians. By Dr. F r. H. R. v. Frank.

Second edition, edited and abridged by Prof. D. R. H. Grützmacher. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, Leipzig. 254 pp. M.7.

In the new edition now published by Grützmacher (1918 and 1923), the numerous foreign words have been deleted, broader explanations shortened, the polemic against Ritschl limited, the overview of the history of systematic theology to the present continued, etc. The table of contents contains the following chapters: 1. 2. God allows the sincere to succeed. 3. beginning of university studies. 4. university life. 5. middle and end of university studies. 6. the personal attitude towards life. Already from these details it is evident that Frank's writing should have more than a mere historical and intellectual interest for American theologians and students. It should be noted here that we do not endorse all the advice given and decisions made in this Vademecum.

Judgments and of course also not to Frank's theological subjectivism, according to which Christian certainty is not based on the inspired Scriptures, but on the experience of theologians.

From the section on "university life" added by Grützmacher, several details may be welcome. We read: "The universities, which are related to the older monastery and cathedral schools, are a creation of the beginning of the thirteenth century, and they arose first in the southern and western countries. In Germany the foundation of universities began about the middle of the fourteenth century. The oldest of the still imperial German universities are Heidelberg (1385), Leipzig (1409), Rostock (1419)." Greifswald was founded in 1456, Tübingen in 1477, Wittenberg in 1502, Marburg in 1527, Königsberg in 1544, Jena in 1556, Würzburg in 1582 (Catholic), Halle in 1694, Göttingen in 1737, Erlangen in 1743, Berlin in 1810, Bonn in 1818. At the turn of the fifteenth century there were about 3500 scholars from the universities, of whom at most 900 went to any one university. From 1525 to 1535 the number of students declined. In 1536, however, a reorganization of the statutes took place in Wittenberg, and soon the number of students here rose to 1000. About 1550 the total number was again 3500. The rapidly increasing frequency sank again during the Thirty Years' War. About 1640 there were 4000 students, 8500 about 1750, and 6000 about 1795. In the time of the wars of liberation the universities almost entirely deserted. At the end of the nineteenth century the number had risen from 36,000, and since the World War it has even exceeded 50,000; among them are more than 3000 Protestant theologians.

In the character of the German universities a decisive change occurred at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. Frank says: "The principle of freedom of thought and teaching is not only proclaimed, but in fact modern philosophical and realistic science enters the university: 'from a school of tradition the university became the workshop of progressive scientific knowledge, the pathfinder of truth, the guide of intellectual life^.' (Paulsen, Das deutsche Bildungswesen, p. 73.)"

This character of the universities as a "place of free scientific research" prevailed universally in the nineteenth century. Theology, too, especially since Schleiermacher, denied its own character and its profession as a preacher and confessor of the divine truth revealed in Holy Scripture, and sank the longer, the more to a pseudo-science groping for truth. She wanted to be (and to a certain extent this is also true of Frank's theology) what she was not and what, according to her nature, she could not be and could never become. Instead of seeking and searching in the Scriptures, where alone God has laid down the treasures of heavenly wisdom, and where faith also finds them surely and infallibly, it sought by the means of philosophy and the secular sciences in reason and experience, where, after all, the wisdom that is heavenly could not be found. Thus modern so-called "scientific" theology stepped out of the ecclesia possidentium and degraded itself to an agnostic philosophical schola quaerentium - a school in which one always only seeks and does not find, always learns and never knows and is certain; a school which finally arrived again at the barren rationalism as represented, for example, by Ritschl and Harnack.

Other changes concerning the universities we read: "As a result of the Abitur examination introduced in 1788, a certain completed education was now established for the youth going to university. The philosophical faculty no longer had to fulfil the task of an upper secondary school, but stood alongside the three other faculties as an equal, in that philosophy fell to it in the broadest sense as its own field of research and it took over the preparation for the increasingly independent teaching profession. Its natural science subjects, together with medicine, became more and more important, for the study and presentation of which practical exercises and corresponding institutes became necessary and were also established to an increasing extent. In the other faculties, seminars developed alongside lectures, while disputations almost disappeared. The philosophical, natural scientific and medical subjects appeared visibly, but also according to their inner importance in the overall framework of the university.

sities became more and more prominent and pushed back theology in particular. While at the beginning of the nineteenth century still the third part of the students were theologians, at the end of the century it is hardly the sixth." The information on the student fraternities, which is admittedly somewhat scanty, is also highly interesting: the compatriot societies and orders of the eighteenth century and the later corps, which "formed the principle of unconditional satisfaction with the associated duel and gradually created the type of the German student at arms." Particularly mentioned among these associations are: the Erlangen Onoldia, founded in 1798; the Burschenschaften (Bursche of Burse = house in which in the Middle Ages students had common board and lodging), founded since 1815, which wrote patriotism, liberalism, and personal honor from their banner, held the "Burschentag" from the Wartburg in 1817 in the interest of a "Teutonic Christianity" and greater freedom at the universities, and against which violent measures were taken after the murder of Kotzebue by Karl Sand; further, the Bubcnruthia in Erlangen, which also emphasized the religious element and chastity; the Christian fraternities formed since 1830 (Uttenruthia in Erlangen in 1843 and Wingold in Halle in 1844), which strove to purify student life from duelling and sexual immorality; the Philadelphia, a Lutheran student association; the singing and gymnastic societies after 1870, and the "Deutsch-Christliche Studentenvereinigung," founded after 1890.

As far as the duel is concerned, Frank believes that it should not be rejected under all circumstances. He knows conditions under which he considers it "permissible, even better than its outright rejection. Frank writes: "I consider it dangerous, but not absolutely impossible, for a young theologian to join another, a 'striking' association. Referring to Matth. 19, 8-12, Frank continues: "There must be cases, then, where it is better to make the inferior moral demand on a man, which he is temporarily able to fulfill, instead of the absolute demand, which he is at present unable to fulfill. Let us not disregard this in the present case [duel]." Frank here confuses what may be better for external civil tranquility, and therefore permitted by Moses, with a moral better that does not exist. Frank's position on the duel can therefore only be called sub-Christian, sub-moral.

Of Ritschl's theology, already mentioned, which, like modern liberalism in general, deletes from Christianity all that is transcendent and supernatural, and admits neither the true deity of Christ, nor his work of atonement, nor any other specifically Christian doctrine, Frank judges: "The essence of this theology may be called the abridgement of Christianity." For "abridgement" we put "utter denial and negation." Why not call a thing by its right name? Concerning Ritschl's greatest disciple, Adolf Harnack, Frank also remarks that he had arrived again at the "old rationalistic trinity: God, virtue, immortality." This is already true with reference to the Master: Ritschl's theology is rationalism in modern, Kantian garb.

"But it is precisely for the sake of this abridgement," Frank continues, "that I wish our young theologians to study the works of Ritschl. For they will thereby become at home in our time, to which the eye is more or less closed to that which is supramundane, beyond appearance." This is true. Among the theologians who have made their mark on our time before others is Ritschl. Whoever knows Ritschl knows the great cancer on the body of modern Christianity, liberalism. But if one calls upon budding theologians to study Ritschl, then one must also put them in a position to see through such aberrations and to resist them successfully. But this can only be done by those who themselves take the right standpoint and really stand in the center of Christian truth, which includes the right standpoint on Scripture, the sola Scriptura, as well as the sola gratia. But the so-called "scientific" theology, even as Frank represents it, is not capable of this. Why? Because it has abandoned the Lutheran principle of Scripture. Consequently, in some respects it has been more of a preschool for liberalism than a stronghold against it.

With reference to the Lutheran Confessions and the study of them we read in Frank: "In any case, however, if there is no time for Melanchthon's Loci

I must insist that the Confessions of our Evangelical Lutheran Church be made the subject of penetrating study, if possible already in the earlier semesters. I cannot easily think of a student who does not try to acquire as soon as possible a good edition of the symbolic books (which, like Müller's, contains both texts, the German and the Latin) as well as a good critical edition of the New Testament. Here, in the Augsburg Confession and in the Apology, he became acquainted with Melanchthon at his best, and likewise with Luther in his Catechism Major, which reveals the quintessence of Protestant truth. The more impartially he surrenders himself to this reading, the more he will be protected from the attempt to extract a few passages from these confessions in order to help establish a doctrine hostile to the Protestant Church. It would be desirable, after all, if the other confessional writings, the Schmalkaldic Articles and the Formula of Concord, were included in the circle of reading while still at university. For to commit oneself to them, as is not infrequently done soon after the theological examination, without having become acquainted even to some extent with their contents, is quite unnatural. And even where this were not the case, a Lutheran theologian should be advised to become acquainted in good time also with the concluding Lutheran Confession."

Especially concerning the "Formula of Concord" Frank lets himself be heard: "I know that there are theologians who are overcome with goose bumps when even the name of the Formula of Concord is mentioned; it is the least read and most hated confession of our church. Certainly, it was no longer that fresh movement, glowing with the first fire of Reformation thought, when the Augsburg Confession began to fly as a flag over the boldly sailing little ship of the Protestant Church, with the proud words as its inscription, "I speak of thy testimonies before kings, and am not ashamed," Ps. 119:46; it was no longer the time as then when Luther's Small Catechism, ingeniously born out of his pious and childlike heart, began its triumphal march through the evangelical world; it was lesser times, corroded by suspicion and distrust, when not infrequently the persons were no longer equal to the things and personal interests forced themselves forward in an evil manner. But all the more must one respect the men who, in the midst of these increased difficulties, took up and carried through the seemingly impossible work with all their strength, even with the temporary sacrifice of their reputation and name. If one wishes to learn how intimate piety, how the original breath of the Reformation combined with the sharpness of dogmatic judgment, the reading and study of the Formula of Concord will not be without profit in this respect either."

These are certainly excellent words. At the same time, however, they show how very modest Frank was in his demands for the study of the symbols more than fifty years ago, and how little sense and understanding remained in Germany and its universities for true Lutheran theology with the fiery zeal for unadulterated divine truth that glowed not only in Luther, but in all Lutheran confessors, especially also in the authors of the Formula of Concord. Some months ago Gußmann wrote: "At least as far as Germany is concerned, scarcely anything has been so deeply cornered, misunderstood, disregarded, and set aside as the confession of the fathers." (L. u. W. l. J., p. 87.) And without remark Grützmacher brings to print the word of Frank: The Formula of Concord "is the least read and the best hated confession of our Church." Such judgments by people who know what they are saying testify loudly to the theological and ecclesiastical degeneration even in the better circles of the German national churches. As before the time of Luther the Bible, so now for a long time in Germany the glorious Lutheran confession lies "under the bank"; and the Bible - it is picked to pieces. F. B.

Twenty-Five Rich Harvest Years. A Brief Story of the St. Louis Lutheran City Mission. Written by F. W. Herzberger. 10 cts.

This report, issued by our City Mission Society in St. Louis, we have read with great interest. It bears abundant testimony to the rich blessings which God has now been bestowing twenty-five years from these of

P. Herzberger's noble work. The report says: "How wonderfully the exalted Head of His Church has blessed this work, far beyond all its founders were able to ask or think! For not only here in St. Louis has our City Mission grown to a marvelous degree, but in the course of years it has spread to such large Lutheran centers as Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Buffalo, New York, Cleveland, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other cities. All of these missions have been inspired through the work started twenty-five years ago by our Lutheran Christians in St. Louis." But one must read the report itself to see how this work, begun by Father Herzberger, has developed and expanded from small beginnings. Therefore, only the following remark may find its place here: "In all our years of prison-work we have had but two or three miscreants to deal with who had attended our Lutheran schools. Not a single Lutheran girl has so far darkened our jail." May God continue to place His blessings upon our town misfions!

F. B.

Hospice Directory. Walther League, 6438 Eggleston Ave, Chicago, Ill.

In our Sunday church prayers we also remember the "travellers by sea and by land". We do not consider this to be superfluous or outdated. However, it does not exclude, but rather includes, the fact that travelers also make use of the help that is offered. To these belongs, especially for our circles, what the Walther League, so active in so many ways, offers in its hospices and its Lutheran Travelers' Welfare Work. The above Hospice Directory, which every pastor should have at hand so that he has the right information ready at the right moment, shows how great the scope of this work already is.

In a bulletin of the Walther League (*Lutheran Travelers' Welfare Work*) we read the following about the necessity of this work: "Our larger cities are perilous places for our young people. They have just been termed 'cesspools of iniquity.' It is bad enough for the young men and women dwelling in the cities under the parental roof, but it is much worse for those coming from other cities and rural communities, who must live in hotels and boarding-houses. The protecting influence of the Christian home is gone. No father and mother are near to guide and counsel. Temptations are many, as are also the tempters. Sinister organizations are constantly at work setting snares and pitfalls, mostly for the young woman who is a stranger in a strange place, but often for the young man as well. It is not an unusual thing for a strange girl to come to one of our larger cities and disappear forever. Theodore Bingham, former Commissioner of Police of New York City, has made the assertion that 'fifty thousand young women and girls are lost in the United States every year. They simply drop out of existence.'" Therefore, one can only rejoice wholeheartedly over the work of the Walther League. From July 13-17, the League will hold its 32nd International Convention at the St. Paul Auditorium. We extend our greetings to the St. Paul gathering and wish the League

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From Synod. The Commission on Distribution was assembled this year in St. Louis from May 27 to 29. There were 164 callings for preaching ministry candidates and 80 callings for teaching ministry candidates. Available for the preaching ministry were 107 candidates and for the teaching ministry 43 candidates. As far as possible, students will help out. The colleges and teacher seminaries are asking for the sending of a larger number of students for the new school year beginning in September. DaS

Teachers' College of our. Teachers' Seminary at Seward, in a printed appeal, says: "Our schools are multiplying; the former stagnation has given way to gratifying progress; soon the scarcity of teachers will become still greater. In our English District, too, the school is coming more and more into prominence. Where we do missionary work, we should always first employ a capable teacher; for if we have the children, we get and keep the parents, and then we shall soon have a flourishing missionary congregation." - The new residence building in Seward was dedicated on May 11. From the report in the "Lutheran" we highlight a few details. "From far and near thousands of Lutheran Christians had rushed to witness the dedication ceremony and to praise and thank God. They were encouraged to do so by the beautiful new building, well suited to its purpose, which itself now stands as a monument to God's grace, and especially by the sermons, which praised the grace of God and rightly emphasized the necessity of Christian teachers for the Christian education of the youth. . . . The high school graduating class was allowed to move into the new building as soon as possible and thus to use it for a few more weeks. This also served to give the visitors a chance to see how the rooms look when they are occupied. Even the most beautiful house still lacks the main thing when it is empty. Above all, it is adorned by the inhabitants themselves. May God therefore always give us for our institution in Seward, as well as for all our educational institutions, truly Christian boys and young men, who in the right fear of God and out of pure love for their Saviour will devote themselves with all seriousness and diligence to their studies and prepare themselves for service in church and school!" F. P.

Even in our country? "According to statistics published by the census bureau in Washington, the number of births has fallen in the past year compared with 1922, while the number of deaths has increased. The highest number of births per thousand of population are in the cities of Wyoming, and the lowest in the rural districts of Montana. The highest number of deaths are in the cities of Mississippi, the lowest in the rural districts of Jdaho." The question is asked: what will become of us only when we lock ourselves against immigration? F. P.

According to newspaper reports, **the number of murders in our country is** 10.2 per hundred thousand. Italy has 3.4 per hundred thousand, England 0.4 and Germany 0.3. The *New York World* remarks: "The-
is not only outrageous, it is downright intolerable. A nation in which acts of violence are perpetrated in such monstrous numbers should, with ruthless candor, subject itself to rigorous self-examination." Almost more alarming is the increase in the number of cases of stratagem robbery in broad daylight. Probably none of us would have thought possible what is going on before our eyes every day. Even the well-organized police in big cities seem almost impotent in the face of this crime. The causes of this unheard-of phenomenon are being investigated. In any case, it is there after the war. What a terrible punishment the world war was and is for our country, too! Even the foundations of civil coexistence are tottering and admonish us to repent. F. P.

Immigration from Germany. The St. Louis "Western Post" publishes the following data taken from immigration statistics.

...are: "The number of Germans emigrating through German and Dutch ports in 1923 is 115,616, which is the largest number of emigrants since the year 1892. For every 100,000 of the total population there were 187 emigrants as against only 60 in 1922, 38 in 1921, and 36 in the last pre-war fifth. Compared with the pre-war year, emigration has thus more than trebled, and compared with the last average fifth of the year it has increased almost fivefold. This extraordinary increase in emigration, in contrast to its increase in the eighties and nineties of the last century, is not so much due to an increased desire to emigrate and to undertake new enterprises, but rather to the constantly more difficult economic situation of the German population. Of the total number of German emigrants, 64, 152 or 56 D. H. via Hamburg, 49,660 or 43 D. H. Who Bremen, a total of 113,812 or 92 D. H. were transported through German ports. Of these, 65,734 were male and 48,078 female. More than half of the German emigrants (of the males 59 per cent, of the females 54 per cent) were of the most vigorous age of seventeen to thirty years. According to marital status, 34,466 were married and 79,346 single. The bulk of the emigrants came from industry (including building), with 45,418, equal to 40 per cent. The next largest number of emigrants was from agriculture and forestry with 16,903, followed in descending order by trade and insurance, domestic services, liberal professions, transport including taverns, and wage labour of a varying nature. In comparison with the year 1922, emigration from all parts of the German Reich has shown an extraordinarily strong increase. The increase in emigration was greatest in Thuringia, Baden, Bavaria, Saxony. Among the provinces of Prussia, emigration has been greatest in Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, and Pomerania. The main stream of German emigrants (over four-fifths) is directed to North America to an even greater extent than in 1922." Immigration has also made itself felt in our church circles, as has become known to us from the Middle and Iowa Districts. F. P.

In the battle of the "fundamentalists" with the "moderns" within the Northern Baptist Church, the "moderns" have won across the board. The convention was held in Milwaukee in late May and early June. The final report, which we take from a German political paper of Milwaukee, says: "The Moderns of the Northern Baptists, who were in session in the auditorium here, had a victory to record on Friday in regard to the great question between them and the Fundamentalists, for their principles were adopted by a large majority, while those of the Fundamentalists were rejected. Moreover, the list of nominations for officers, which the Moderns had put up, was adopted. It is seen from this that in the Baptist Church the modern aspiration has set in to such an extent that it can no longer be stopped. But it is assured that no separation will arise in the church." - From the debates on both sides we place here a few particulars. D. Stratton seems to have been the chief representative of the Fundamentalists. He charged that the Moderns were destroying the foundation of the Christian Church. They were already taking a

controlling position within the Baptist Church. If they fully asserted themselves, there would soon be no Baptists left on American soil. The modern trend also already dominates the Gentile mission. The goal in Gentile missions, he said, is not to save souls, but to bring about "a social and economic world improvement." "But what profit is this, and who cares how many inhabitants of those countries [namely, the heathen countries] are converted, if this conversion takes place on a modern basis? The students of the foreign missions of the Baptists are instructed to ask questions concerning evolution, and to doubt the holy birth of Christ, instead of studying the doctrines of the Bible." D. Stratton explained that the Baptist faith was based solely on fundamental doctrines of the holy birth of Christ, the authority of the Bible, the second coming of Christ, and the resurrection. Without these creeds, he said, there is no religion, but only a materialistic pantheism. "The only possible bond among Baptists is their adherence to divinely revealed religion. If this is lost, all is lost, and then there will be no Baptists left on American soil." Next to Stratton, D. Fetler, general director of the mission in Russia, and D. Porter, of Louisville, Ky. advocated the Fundamentalists. D. Stratton also blamed the moderns for the Baptists losing the sum of $2,500,000 in the "ill-fated Inter- church Movement." This should be forgotten, he said, but a reminder is in order. - However, all efforts of the fundamentalists to bring their position to bear were in vain. The newspaper report goes on to say: "The Convention adopted a liberal declaration of principles, according to which everyone can be blessed according to his own opinion; however, it takes a stand against war, against the evil of divorce, against Sunday enjoyment and the liquor trade. The Declaration of Principles is the Stockholm Declaration, adopted in July, 1923, at the World Baptist Convention in Sweden, and now also adopted by Northern Baptists as a creed, but not as a binding commitment. The adoption was preceded by a hot battle of speeches during which the Fundamentalists attempted to get another creed adopted, which would have held the Convention strictly to the provisions of the Bible, even of the creation of the world, in strict opposition to the doctrine of evolution. Judge Fred B. Freeman of Minneapolis advocated the adoption of the Stockholm Declaration. Rejected was a substitute of the substance that Satan was a real person and the secret force behind the present apostasy, that no error was found in the Bible, and that all men were sinners after the fall. The substitute also affirmed the holy birth of Christ, and the literal view of the creation of the world as given in Genesis." , F. P.

By-products of the Baptist Convention. In regard to the use of foreign languages, it was noted in the committee report that it was not worth the trouble and against the interests of the country to teach foreign languages and to promote their use. "On the other hand, it was the duty and right to use every language for the propagation of Baptist doctrine." . Let us hope that Baptists will concede the same right to other congregations.

to the members of the Board of Directors. The resolution adopted by the assembly is in two parts. "The first part states that congregations with a sufficient number of members should continue to hold their services in the native language, since experience has shown that this is advantageous for the Baptist Church, but that services and Sunday school lessons should also be held in the English language. On the other hand, the second part, in which congregations of foreign languages are to be recognized as organizations of equal standing, was postponed until the next Convention." - With regard to wars, it was resolved that they must cease altogether. "With great applause was received Friday evening the announcement of Dr. Charles W. Gilkey, of Chicago, who declared that Baptists would adopt resolutions against war, and when done would stand in line with Methodists and Presbyterians." The causes of the wars were also discussed at length. "Dr. Gilkey, in his address, declared that world peace could not be maintained so long as the power of money played such a part and was brought into use against Christian missions. Nations like Japan and China, and others who have had to put up with similar treatment, have been led to believe that it is not religion but the money-bag that exercises the governing power, and that Christian peoples and nations do not act according to its words. The main cause is that in diplomacy and commerce there are unscrupulous persons at the head, who are not so much working for international friendship as for the protection of their own interests. Therefore, he said, it was the duty of all Christians to take matters in hand and so conduct them that friendship might exist and all wars be eradicated. Dr. E. A. Barbour, of New York, brought the greetings of the Baptists of England, and urged that the Baptists and other Christians of the United States should contribute to a crusade against wars, and work hand in hand with the Christians of England." - Resolutions were also passed in regard to other questions of the day. "In a resolution the Convention has declared itself in favor of carrying out the Prohibition Act. It asks all good Americans to help to see that the law is not evaded. Concerning the many divorces in the country, it declared itself in favor of a national law for marriages and divorces, citing the failure to observe religious customs in the home as contributing to the occurrence of so many juvenile aberrations. The Wandelbildertheater owners were requested to show only such pictures as would bring people to a higher moral standpoint." - Speaking with little expertise, D. Stratton attempted to send off the blame for the spread of modernism in America on Germany. According to the newspaper report, Stratton said, "The modern trend should be called 'made in Germany.' It has come over to us from Prussianized Germany. The German mind is a prosaic one and prone to conspiracies its peculiar combination of predicates], and the old Germany of a Schiller and Goethe has been strangled to death by modern rationalism and militarism, [As is well known, Schiller and Goethe were themselves rationalists in the theological sense]. It is a significant fact that the

Presidents of most' American universities hold degrees from German universities. America is infested with the 'new theology' of German rationalism and militarism." What a lack of historical and theological knowledge is revealed when the real origin of Modernism is transferred to Germany was clearly stated by D. Bente in the April issue of this magazine in the article "Zwingli als Bahnbrecher der Moderne" ("Zwingli as a Pioneer of Modernism"). There is no harm in reprinting the following words: "In the great march of conquest and victory that liberalism has been holding in America, especially since the World War, through almost all sects, the assertion appears again and again, especially among fundamentalists, that, like all misery in the world, modern unbelief also has its real source in Germany. And the guilt of the German critics does not want to be diminished or even denied. But it must not be overlooked that England and America are in the same damnation. In particular, it should be noted that in America, long before the wider acquaintance with German unbelief in almost all sectarian churches, especially among the Congregationalists, Disciples and Baptists, the general indifference to doctrine and hostility against any firm confession had opened the gates to all false doctrines and allowed them free play; that, further, the Unitarians, Universalists, and Lodges, all of which had great success in America more than a hundred years ago, did not import their unbelief from Germany; that, finally, the ultimate roots even of German Liberalism are to be sought not in Luther, but in Zwingli, Calvin, and the Reformed. In America, too, the sons of Zwingli and Calvin need not import unbelief; it is in their blood." F. P.

II. Abroad.

At the party meeting recently held in Moscow, resolutions were passed on the **position of the Russian Communist Party with regard to religion.** According to these, the Russian peasants are not to be persecuted for their adherence to the old religion. "Anti-religious propaganda" is expressly forbidden. The peasants are, however, to be provided with scientific instruction for the good of the country, in order to awaken in them the realization that a good harvest is not due to God, but develops of its own accord from the Russian soil. The Associated Press reports from Moscow under June 1: "The Congress of the Communist Party ended yesterday with the election of a new Central Committee, enlarged from forty to fifty members. Most of the old leaders were re-elected. . . . Among the other resolutions adopted by the party congress, one particularly noteworthy is that prohibiting all anti-religious propaganda in any form among the Russian peasants. The resolution recommends, however, that the peasants be given scientific education "so that they may realize that their crops and their general welfare do not depend on Providence.'" In line with this atheism, it was also decided that it was not permissible within the Communist Party to have its own judgment of right or wrong. This is clearly stated when the report says: "At Zinoviev's request, before the election of the

A resolution was adopted by the Central Committee unreservedly approving the tactics of the Central Executive Committee and advising it to take the strictest measures against the slightest attempt to form groups and factions." The War Commissar Trotsky had been critical of the Central Committee. As a result, doubts were raised as to his party loyalty. Trotsky, however, removed the doubts by declaring, "We must always say, right or wrong, this is the decision of our party." He invoked for this moral the example of the "nationalists" or patriots of the fatherland. He said, "Just as the nationalists pledge allegiance to the country with the slogan, 'My fatherland, right or wrong, my fatherland,' so the com munists must pledge allegiance to communism with the slogan, 'My party, right or wrong.'" Unfortunately, Trotsky is right in his exemplification. The motto: "My country, right or wrong, always my country" consequently presupposes that there is no God, even if many do not become aware of this consequence. We have the analogue in the ecclesiastical sphere in the papacy: Roma locuta, res decisa est. One's own conscience is set aside. He who renounces his own conscience, laudabiliter se subjicit. F. P.

The Exclusion Clause and the American Mission in Japan. The Associated Press reports from Tokyo, May 29: "According to reports in Japanese newspapers, the smaller native Christian congregations have suffered a severe blow from the exclusion clause against Japanese in the American immigration law. The action of the American Congress has made the Japanese suspicious of Christian missions and their teachings and has caused many Japanese Christians to leave the church. Native Christian leaders have stated in the press that few Japanese believe in Christianity as taught by missionaries here. They regard it as a delusion and the creed of Christian philanthropy, righteousness and brotherhood as false. The exclusion clause in the immigration bill, they say, will bring about a separation of the Christian churches in Japan from the American missions, and will encourage Japanese Christians to exist without support from foreigners."

Japan's world mission according to Japanese opinion. The Associated Press reports from Tokyo on June 10 that the Indian poet Tagore delivered an address to two thousand students in which the following basic statements were made: "Because Japan and India have much in common culturally, we feel deeply the unworthy treatment Japan has received by excluding its citizens from immigration to America." "Japan's mission in the Orient is in the spiritual field. It should be the champion of Oriental culture and civilization, which is fundamentally different from Western civilization. Western civilization is well unified. It aims at the acquisition of wealth instead of the bliss of man. It is greedy and suicidal. It is of paramount importance for us as Asians to also unify our own civilization in order to realize the hopes and aspirations of the Orient." Dr. Chaim Waizmann, the leader of the Jewish Zionists, asserted the same principles. Only he put on

the place of the Japanese mission in the "spiritual" field the Jewish one. Ford teaches in his publications *(The International Jew) that* the claim of the Jews to be the dominant world power has passed by divine appointment to the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic Raffe. Russian Communism, too, vindicates itself with great energy of a world mission. But it disdains the religious mask. It wants, as has already been said, to free the Russian peasants, for example, from the idea that God has something to do with a good harvest by means of scientific instruction. In the meantime, until the teaching of science has borne fruit, a relatively small number of Communists want to rule Ruhland for the good of the country and as a shining example to the rest of the world. Besides this, the Russian Communist leaders do not disdain external armed force. They have recently stressed, as have other governments, that the time for warlike disarmament has not yet come. Through these various clashing "world missions" springing from human folly and wickedness, ample provision has been made to ensure that wars will not cease before the Last Day.

F. P.

Presumption and Satanic Delusion of the Pope. The "Ev.-Luth. Freikirche" reports: "Pope Pius XI addressed the College of Cardinals at the secret consistory held at the end of March. Great, says the Pope, recalling the separated faithful who do not belong to the Mother Church, is the number of those who thirst for love and truth, for unity and peace, who, seeking, fix their eyes on the Apostolic See, or, either standing in schism or as scattered and strayed sheep, are attracted to the one great sheepfold. If they heed the pastoral call which God, the supreme shepherd of souls, has sent to them through him, the pope, the call: "Come to me, all of you!" and if they want to hasten their return to the mother church, he will receive them with the fatherly words: "All mine is yours! But to all those Catholics, the Pope expressly adds here, he would be extremely grateful, who, impelled by God's grace, would smooth the way of the separated brethren to the true faith, and endeavor to remove their prejudices, in order to instruct them in the doctrines of the Catholic Church." The "Free Church" adds, "This is the beckoning voice of him in whom, according to the Scriptures, we must see the great Antichrist, who by bold words and splendid speech seduces innocent hearts, Rom . 16:18, but he shall not succeed. Christ's sheep follow not after the stranger, but flee from him, John 10:5." - In Lutheran circles, too, one has spoken of "pious popes," thinking of popes who have led a worldly honest life. Who has forgotten that even the "pious popes" in this sense are instruments of wickedness, as they cannot be thought more satanic. Pretending to be Christ's representatives on earth, and under dazzling ecclesiastical pretence, they curse with the Tridentinum the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, that man, without works of the law, obtains forgiveness of sins and beatitude by trusting in Christ's merit. Surely not merely an extra devil drives into every "pious" person who sits in the papal chair. F. P.

A protest from German teachers against the doctrine of a "German God". A certain Wilhelm Schäfer published a writing under the title "The German God. Five Letters to My People." Against this the editor of the "Deutsche Lehrerzeitung," Rector (ret.) August Grünweller, writes, among other things: "The basic theme is again the 'German God,' the God who is to be born out of the German national soul." "The 'German God' is to be instinct, free will, or free moral action. From all this it is clear that Wilhelm Schäfer regards it as his special völkisch mission to combat Biblical Christianity and to be a herald of the 'German God' he conceives. This God is, at the deepest bottom, völkisch self-devotion. Whether this imaginary God can redeem our poor German people from their abysmal misery, whether he can give comfort, strength, peace in living and dying, is admittedly a question which is not a question for me. In the old Gospel of the Crucified and Risen One there slumbers a power stronger than death and the devil, because it is God's power. This power has manifested itself in the martyrs of the Church; it manifests itself again and again in that it makes glad and free, breaks chains of sin, and triumphantly overcomes death. I am also convinced that it is the only effective means of renewing our people. It proved this after the Thirty Years' War and in the time of the liberation struggles at the beginning of the last century. I deeply regret that Schäfer is to be found in the camp of the fiercest opponents of biblical Christianity, and that I therefore cannot recommend the two writings under discussion, in spite of many subtle remarks, for the sake of their decidedly anti-Christian tendency."

F. P.

Fr. Pätiälä writes **about the new Free Church congregations in Finland in** his Esperanto journal *Kristana Espero.* Fr. Haussen in Bremer, Iowa,
has provided the following translation of the article in question: "At the end of the past year and the beginning of the new year, six new local Faith Lutheran congregations have been established in Finland. Surely the number of such congregations will increase in the near future. We blessed children of God, true believers, did not know in past times the doctrine of Christ of local Christian congregations, which are sanctified by forgiveness through faith in JESUS Christ, who earned and acquired a church on earth through his own blood, Acts 20:28. But through like-minded foreign brethren in the faith, the dear heavenly Father, in His great mercy, enlightened us about this very important doctrine. This was through brethren belonging to the great Missouri Synod in the United States and to the Ev.-Luth. Free Church in Germany. The first acquaintance with these faithful Lutheran church bodies was initiated through Esperanto correspondence. The following document was signed at the founding meeting of one of these Free Church congregations: 'In His great grace, the Lord our God once made the people of Finland partakers of the church renewal which He brought about through His servant D. M. Luther. In the Lutheran Church of Finland alone, the pure doctrine of grace was practically hidden for centuries and covered up by the oral and written proclamation of many a false doctrinal system. However, at the beginning of the last century, God again brought the truth of the gospel brightly to light through His servant F. G.

Hedberg. We too were made partakers of this blessing. And in this present sad time of general spiritual confusion, God, in His great love, continued to enlighten us about the biblical doctrine of the church through the ministry of American and German brethren in the faith, especially about the doctrine of local churches of believers and their rights and duties. We the undersigned separate from the Ev.-Lutheran Church in Finland because it is connected with the state against God's Word, because in most of its parishes the Word of God is taught falsely, because in it publicly proclaimed false doctrine is permitted, because in it the training of pastors is in the hands of rationalists and Bible critics, because in it the congregations do not have their biblical rights, because in its congregations the openly ungodly and hypocrites are counted as members, because in its congregations church discipline is not practiced and may not be practiced, and finally, because the Scriptures know no other congregations than congregations of believers. As a reason for our withdrawal from the Finnish state church we refer to the following scriptural passages: Our Lord Jesus Christ saith, "Beware of false prophets, which come unto you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves," Matt. 7:15, "And the sheep follow him; for they know his voice. But they follow not a stranger, but flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers," John 10:4, 5. But the apostle Paul addresses the following exhortation to the believers at Rome: "Now I exhort you, brethren, that ye take heed to them which cause divisions and offences beside the doctrine which ye have learned, and depart from them." Rom . 16, 17. The same also writes to the church of God at Corinth, to the saints in Christ JEsu, these clear and emphatic words, "Pull not on the strange yoke with the unbelievers. For what enjoyment has righteousness with unrighteousness? What fellowship hath light with darkness? How does Christ agree with Belial? Or what part hath the believer with the unbeliever? What part hath the temple of God with idols? But ye are the temple of the living God: as God saith, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and will be their God, and they shall be my people. Therefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the LORD, and touch no unclean thing: and I will receive you, and be your Father, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the LORD Almighty," 2 Cor. 6:14-18. To us, the believers in the last days, the following words of the Revelation apply especially, piercing as fire: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, lest ye receive of her plagues. For their sins reach unto heaven, and God remembereth their iniquities," Revelation 18:4, 5. Of the church at Jerusalem it is written, and this is also for our learning, "But they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers," Acts 2:42. 2:42. We the undersigned join together to form a local Bible Lutheran congregation whose name is: "Free Evangelical Lutheran Congregation at X."' This document was signed by nine people. The people who joined this little congregation for the truth of God's Word have been much ridiculed -md persecuted for their courageous act. But God's Word

gives comfort and great joy to him who has thrown off the chains of the mixed and only in name Lutheran national church. The difficulties that will have to be overcome are great, but our Lord Jesus Christ is among his disciples until the end of the world in such right congregations where God's Word is taught without any falsification and is believed as truth. He loves and cares for His Church, which He has dearly purchased, and helps it through all tribulations into the glory of His heavenly Kingdom of Honor^" D.

About the ecclesiastical turmoil in the Memelland we find the following announcement in a local political newspaper: "The Memelland was separated from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. At first it was under the supervision of a French governor, and according to a provision of the League of Nations it is now administered by a Lithuanian Land Directorate. While the Memelland belonged to Germany, most of the parishes formed a part of the Prussian Landeskirche. Of the 150,000 inhabitants of the country, 144,000 are Protestants. Most of these Protestants are German, but for a large part Lithuanian is their mother tongue. The Prussian Church had taken the linguistic conditions into consideration by serving in both languages. With the exception of two pastors who served purely German congregations in the city of Memel, all clergy in this area had to learn the Lithuanian language. For this reason, lectures were given in Lithuanian at the university in Königsberg, and the church provided a Lithuanian translation of the Bible and a hymnal in the same language. Educated Lithuanians have testified that their language would have perished long ago if the Protestant Church had not cultivated it. It is therefore understandable that when the country was separated from Germany, all the Protestant congregations decided to remain connected with the Prussian church, as was also done in Danzig and eastern Upper Silesia with the consent of the Polish government. The French governor gave his consent to this. The Lithuanian Landesdirektorium also at first took the self-evident stand and entered into negotiation with the Prussian Oberkirchenrat in order to settle the matter. The Directorate agreed to the plan whereby the Protestant Church of the Memel region would remain affiliated with the Protestant Church in Prussia as a regional synod with its own constitution and administration. No sooner, however, were the first steps toward the reorganization of the church taken, than the Land Directorate suddenly issued a decree that the Protestant congregations were to separate from the mother tongue. To carry out this measure a pastor was appointed, to whom were transferred all the powers of the Landessuperintendent, the Konsistorium, and the Oberkirchenrat. There was only one pastor to be had for this position, a brother of the president in the state board of directors. The pastors who would not comply were threatened with deprivation of salary, prosecution, and expulsion, but all but one of the pastors protested, and by unanimous vote manifested that they did not recognize the ordinance, and their congregations stood by them. " F. P.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. August 1924. No. 8.

The so-called vengeance Psalms.

The name "vengeance Psalms" is often used to refer to a number of Psalms that strike the reader with what appear to be strong outbursts of anger on the part of the poet, with threats and wishes of evil and punishment, and even with curses and imprecations. So strong is this characteristic trait in some Psalms, so terrible are these curses in some passages, and so bitterly malicious these imprecations, that the reader, especially the Christian reader, can hardly help feeling uneasy at first, and perhaps a mild shudder runs over him. Nevertheless, the name "vengeance psalm" seems very unhappily chosen. For this name presupposes a twofold assumption: first, that the Psalm in question bears wholly, or at least for the most part, the character briefly described above; secondly, that those punitive imprecations, curses, imprecations really do show the spirit, the feeling of revenge, that they really flowed out of a desire and lust for revenge. But these two suppositions do not correspond to the facts. Even such psalms as we must rank above others among the so-called vengeance psalms, consist only in part of such outbursts of feeling; and it cannot be proved, as this work seeks to show, that personal or national vindictiveness dictated to the author's pen the expressions complained of. More suitable, then, would be, for instance, the names "cursing psalm," "imprecatory psalm," or the like, if one would by all means have a name for it; as, indeed, English theologians and critics make use of the expression "imprecatory psalm." For imprecation, imprecatio, may well spring from feelings quite different from the thirst for vengeance.

We must first determine what actually makes a psalm a psalm of cursing, and which psalms we are to include in this class. Of course, we cannot consider the psalms in which the final fate of the wicked, their final destruction, is pointed out, and in which the holy writer holds out the prospect of God's wrath and judgment to the wicked if they do not repent. Among the 150 psalms of the Bible there are very few which do not contain such remarks. The present happiness and

The well-being of the wicked and the misfortune and suffering of the pious, as well as the final reversal of this disproportion by God's punishing, retributive justice: this is, as is well known, a very popular, often recurring theme in the Psalms. Compare the 37th Psalm, in which the subject is thus stated, "Be not angry with the wicked, be not envious of the transgressors; for as the grass they shall soon be cut down, and as the green herb they shall wither"; and the 73rd Psalm, in which the question is thus stated.The question is put thus, "But I almost stumbled with my feet, my footsteps almost slipped; for I was displeased with the glorifiers, when I saw that the wicked fared so well," where the solution is later given: "But thou setest them on the slippery, and castest them down. How suddenly they are destroyed! They perish and come to an end with terror." An examination of the Psalms leads to the result that very few are free from such announcements and prophecies of judgment, which are then, in accordance with the poetical character of the Psalms, mostly couched in figurative speech.

Then there is a whole series of Psalms in which the punishment, the wrath of God against the wicked is not predicted in an objective way and announced as certain, but in which the poet subjectively expresses his satisfaction and agreement with this judgment, agrees with God in his judgment, and even calls on him to such judgment. Expressions of this kind are found in a great many psalms, often with the same or very similar words. Compare, for example: "Be ashamed and be put to shame, they that seek my calamity," Ps. 71:24; and so or similarly Ps. 83:18; 6:11; 36:4, 26; further, "The wicked must fall into their own net together," Ps. 140:10, and similarly Ps. 7:16; 35:7, 8. In these expressions the poet prays that his persistent, malicious enemies may be put to shame in their wicked attempts; that God may execute upon them the judgment which his law threatens to such evildoers; that God may save him from his distress, which can only happen through the harm of those enemies who will not desist from their wicked ways. But such expressions cannot be offensive to any Christian who knows the seriousness and holiness of the divine law, and therefore cannot help agreeing with God in his judgments, and rejoicing in them without gloating, but in holy earnestness. Thus we shall not call the Psalms, in which such phrases are found, vengeance Psalms without further ado. To whom such words nevertheless seem questionable, let him refer what remains to be said about the actual vengeance or cursing Psalms also to the modes of speech just mentioned. Also words like: "I hate those who hate you; ... I hate them in all earnestness," Ps. 139:21, 22, belong here. It cannot be strange to anyone that David turns against the enemies of God in deep displeasure,

of the glorious, exalted God whom he has just praised, and that he assures us he regards the enemies of God as his own enemies. How do we feel when we read the blasphemous speeches of a Voltaire or an Ingersoll, the omissions of a Harnack which undermine all faith, the soul-destroying attacks of the modernists of today on the heart of Christianity? The enemies of God are also the enemies of the people of God, and vice versa. But all this will have to be elaborated upon when discussing the actual cursing Psalms.

But while the above-mentioned occasional imprecations of punishment are found in a whole series of Psalms, in some - not many! - Psalms, this moment is particularly strong, rising to the level of imprecations that seem to come from a heart filled with anger and rage. In some psalms the poet hurls at his enemy or enemies a whole series of the heaviest, most ghastly imprecations, and calls down upon them emphatically, solemnly God's wrath and curse. The Psalms 35, 58, 59, 69, 83, 109, especially the last three, come mainly into consideration here. In addition, there are also isolated imprecations in some other Psalms that are characterized by extraordinary vehemence, such as Ps. 55, 56, 79, 137.

Before discussing the psalms or psalm passages in question, a few remarks on the question posed by the vengeance psalms are not out of place. That there is a question to be solved here for us men, a difficulty to be removed, will at once become clear to every reader who compares those curses and imprecations with the words of our Saviour: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you," etc., as well as with many other passages, not only of the New, but also of the Old Testament, in which forgiveness, conciliation, patient bearing love are exhorted. The common name "vengeance psalm" already indicates how much the hardships that lie in those psalms for our understanding and our feelings have been felt and sensed.

In fact, these Psalms have also received an extremely unfavorable assessment from many sides. That unbelievers, who regard the Bible as a purely human book, and who, when they examine it according to content and form, apply exactly the same standards as when they criticize any literary product, cannot acquire any particular taste for the vengeance Psalms, does not surprise us. On the contrary, those enemies of the faith in the Bible, in their attacks on the Holy Scriptures, have chosen the Psalms of cursing as their object of attack, and have brought the most serious charges against them. They often cannot do enough in moral indignation over the outbursts of immoderate, passionate anger, over the lust for revenge, the cruelty, the ruthlessness, the unkindness,

the thirst for blood, all of which they believe are expressed in those Psalms. In particular, they are deeply indignant about the way in which the psalmist calls upon God to protect his people Israel and to destroy, and often also to exterminate, the enemies of this people; they strongly condemn the attitude manifested here as narrow-mindedness, exclusiveness and intolerance, as political nativism and religious fanaticism of the worst kind. They maintain that the concept of God, as it appears here, lacks much of the purity and sublimity which are otherwise characteristic of the Jews; that God, the LORD of hosts, is here degraded to a mere national deity. And for this very reason, these people argue, the inspiration and divinity of the Bible cannot be maintained; a book which has such defects cannot claim to be recognized as God's Word.

And unfortunately there are not a few theologians who still want to be Christian and believers, but who have no hesitation in agreeing with the views just mentioned, even if not to the full extent; who likewise make those accusations, even if with some limitations. Most of these theologians - according to the majority they are more or less radical critics - speak approximately as follows: It is true that the Old Testament was also inspired in one way, but the inspiration was still weak and imperfect at that time, and this defective inspiration shows itself especially in the vengeance Psalms; there the writers and poets had a great deal of humanity mixed up with it. We must give credit for these expressions, however much we may regret them, to the time of that time, and excuse them to the best of our ability; above all, we must take into consideration the infinite distance between these Psalms and the words of Jesus Christ, in order to recognize how much better the law of Christ is than the old Mosaic law.

Here may follow a few sayings, by well-known theologians on this subject. The famous English exegete and radical critic Canon Cheyne, in his book *Aids io Devout Study of Criticism,* asserts that the inspiration of the Psalmists is very imperfectly given.

Their prophetic presentiment was often corrupted by the infirmity of human passion. (p. 153.) It need scarcely be mentioned that by inspiration he by no means understands verbal inspiration, that is, not inspiration at all in the proper, theological sense. Often the explanation of the vengeance Psalms and their judgment contain a mixture of good and bad, of fiction and truth. Thus in J. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* vol. IV, p. 158 s. The words are here given in free translation: "At times bitter hatred is expressed, which seems to be personal rather than national, the expression of wild joy at the downfall of hated enemies rather than earnest expectation of judgment on the wicked. . . . The imprecatory psalms are now better

understood than they once did. He who reads raw vindictiveness into it is no less far from the mark than he who in misguided zeal asserts that in an inspired Bible all the sayings of godly men must be justifiable even to the highest moral demands. But the solution of a moral difficulty is not to be found in a fearful compromise between two extremes. The fierce language in Ps. 7, 35, 69, 109, &c., must not be censured as the evocation of a personally vindictive spirit. The law rejects this as well as the gospel; and in the psalm where the strongest expressions are found, the writer denies the existence of such penal spite, Ps. 109, 4. 5. As a member of the covenant people, the psalmist may identify himself with the friends of God, and count such as oppose him among the enemies of God, Ps. 139, 21. 22. He does not always give the ground of his anger and prayer for destruction, as in Ps. 83; but one is justified, at least in most passages, in reading those thoughts, though they are not expressed." Up to this point most of it might be well accepted, but now the writer continues, "It does not follow that the spirit of the vengeance Psalms is justified by the standard of the New Testament. True, it will be well to reproach oneself whether the Old Testament saints did not, in the simplicity and earnestness of their piety, nurture a righteous anger against evil which the lighter and slacker moral sense of later generations should have retained. Ye that love Jehovah, hate evil! is an exhortation which belongs not to one age, but to every age." The last thought is again true. Further, "But here it is not a question of the attitude to evildoers, but to evildoers. And there it must evidently be acknowledged that the moral standard of the Old Covenant was necessarily lower than that of the New. . . . Without a Pharisaic spirit and a lofty pride of virtue-which would be very ill-advised-the Christian, nevertheless, cannot use the language of the Psalms of cursing, but interprets the spirit of that language by reserving his wrath for the evil in himself and others, and by seeking to combine with it something of the merciful love of his Saviour against evildoers." We see, this exegete also wishes to state a difference between the spirit and inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, so as to remove the objectionable thing which he finds in the cursing Psalms. About the same position is taken by the English theologian Ellicot. He speaks, for example, in his *Old Testament Commentary* (Vol. IV, p. 171, on the 69th Psalm) of a "fierce torrent of invective,.... an invective we can best appreciate, if we cannot excuse it, by remembering that it was the outcome, not of personal hatred, but of religious exclusiveness." He admits that the Church referred this Psalm to Christ, but says: "In doing so, they fastened upon accidental coinci-

dences and altogether ignored the impassable distance between one who could be the mouthpiece of such terrible curses and Jesus Christ." (P. 186.) And on the 79th Psalm, "We naturally contrast the law of Christian forgiveness." (p. 206.) On the 109th Psalm: "The peculiar horror of the imprecations in this extraordinary psalm does not lie in . . ., nor is this horror due to the fact, assuming it to be a fact, that these imprecations are not general in their direction, like the misanthrope's curses, but are leveled at a single individual; for the passions of revenge and hatred intensify by contraction of their range. The whole difficulty of the psalm lies in the fact that it was, as the inscription shows, actually, if not primarily, intended for use in the public service of the Sanctuary. But this use at once divests the psalm of one of the greatest sources of difficulty, its personal character. Whatever its origin, whoever the original object of the imprecations, it is certain that they became public, ecclesiastical, national. . . . Certainly, when sung by the congregation, it expressed not an individual longing for revenge, but all the pent-up feeling - religious abhorrence, patriotic hatred, moral detestation-of the community. ... . . The continuance of its recitation in Christian churches opens up another question and has, in a great measure, been the motive for the various apologetic explanations that have been started for this psalm. It is strange that even yet the old theory, which justifies the language of the imprecations as prophetically the language of Christ, should find advocates." (P. 249.) We must call his view fundamentally erroneous, and his exegetical explanations are also entirely invalidated by an examination of the psalms referred to. Ellicot's remark on the 137th Psalm may also be applied here at once: "The 'luxury of revenge' is well expressed in this beatitude [it is the verse: "Blessed is he who takes thy young children and dashes them to pieces against the stone"], pronounced on him who can carry out to all its bitter end the lex talionis. Commentators have in turn tried to disguise and justify the expression of passion. Happily the Bible allows us to see men as they were, without taking their rules of feeling and conduct as ours. The psalm is beautiful as a poem - the Christian must seek his inspiration elsewhere." (P. 283. 284.) (Conclusion follows.) Henry Hamann.

On the Evaluation of the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach.

(Continued.)

We are not in a position to judge the second part of the Confession Resolution, which is intended to express the position of the World Convention with regard to the Confessions, in a manner substantially different from the first part, which concerns Scripture. Taken by itself and detached from the

Eisenach context, there is nothing wrong with this declaration either. It does not follow, however, that the World Convention, by accepting it, documented its "unchanging loyalty" to the Lutheran confession, nor that Lutherans of conviction, in communion with the Convention delegates, could have voted for such acceptance.

In its symbols, the Lutheran Church not only declares that Scripture is the only pure source and infallible standard of doctrine, but also presents this doctrine itself (without claiming absolute completeness) clearly and thoroughly and confesses it as the only correct understanding of Scripture and therefore also as the correct expression of its own faith, teaching, and confession. Nor does it conceal this agreement, but it absolutely confesses the entire doctrinal content of all confessions, including the Formula of Concord. It commits all its members, especially its preachers and professors, to everything that the Concordia of 1580 presents as doctrine (but also only to this, because the confession and the commitment to the same have to do only with doctrine). Yea, to all Christians in the world it declares that they are all guilty of confessing these doctrines as to the sole divine truth itself. Faithful Lutherans also take on such an obligation with joy, without any compulsion, because in doing so they only confess the faith that lives in them, and only let their mouths overflow with that which fills their hearts. The vow of confession is not a burden to them, but an honor and a pleasure, even more than every American's oath of loyalty.

And what is the reason, then, why Lutherans stand by the Confession? Solely this: Because they have convinced themselves, and continue to convince themselves anew, that all the doctrines of the Concord of 1580 are taken from and agree with the sole source and norm of Christian truth, the Scriptures. This is precisely the position which the Lutheran Confession itself expresses everywhere, directly or indirectly. And it, it alone, is compatible with Scripture, nor is it in contradiction with itself. The Scriptures want all Christians to believe and confess all the doctrines presented by them as divine truths, and that solely for the reason that it, the Scriptures, the infallible Word of the great God Himself, teaches them. He who accepts the confession for any other reason denies the Scriptural principle, the foundation of Lutheranism. He who accepts the confession because it is made by Lutheran theologians, or because our church demands its acceptance, or because it agrees, as he thinks, with his own system of doctrine, or with some other extra-biblical principle, substitutes human authority for God. The Lutheran Confessions, while stating, testifying, and confessing the truth, decide

But the judge who alone decides what is true and what is false, what is right and what is wrong, is not the confession, but Scripture. Therefore Lutherans do not accept the doctrines of the confession because they are in the symbols, but, as I said, solely because they are taken from Scripture.

A signature with all kinds of restrictions and conditions is not compatible with this position. The confession must be accepted completely and unconditionally, precisely because it is a confession of doctrines taken from Scripture. He who declares the Concordia to be his confession, and then signs it only conditionally, denies Scripture, contradicts himself, and frustrates the purpose of the symbols. He denies the Scriptures, for the question mark which he puts behind any doctrine of the Confession comes at the same time to stand behind the passages of Scripture from which it is taken; and the line which he draws through any doctrine of the Confession he at the same time draws through the statements of Scripture on which it is founded.

Further, he who signs conditionally contradicts himself, for by the condition he annuls the essence of confession. He says he wants to confess, and then does the opposite of what he himself thinks he is doing, in that by adding the condition he cancels his confession and casts doubt on everything. Where he pretends to want to shred points, there he puts question marks. To confess is to say clearly and distinctly, firmly and definitely, what one believes, teaches, and confesses. To confess conditionally, however, is to put diplomatically on screws, and thus, strictly speaking, not to confess at all, but to leave uncertain. To confess conditionally is to say what one believes, but in such a way that one does not expose oneself in the process, and that even after such "confession" no one knows and is able to state exactly what has actually been confessed. By conditional obligation, finally, the purpose of confession is frustrated, the very thing which the church seeks to accomplish by establishing the symbols and committing herself to them: clear, firm, Scriptural public teaching; protection from dishonest spirits and false doctrines; preservation and propagation of the unadulterated truth to the descendants. How unchristian and unLutheran, then, how contradictory and foolish, when the church demands commitment from its teachers and preachers, but then is satisfied with conditional promises!

But the number of false Lutherans, especially among the "theologians" who no longer want to be bound by confessions, is growing. If such are then unable to evade the obligation, they make use of all kinds of excuses and formulas in order to take away the binding force of their vow. One signs the confession with quatenus: inasmuch as its doctrines agree with Scripture. Or one declares the confession to be true, if one interprets it rightly according to Scripture. Or one confesses the same in

similar way, as Calvin did to the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession: he accepts it as Melanchthon understood it. Or, like the General Synod in former times, one describes the confession as an essentially correct presentation of the truth of Scripture. Or one limits the obligatory to the main doctrines, to "the confession in the confession." Or one says obligatory only sentences introduced with, "We believe, teach, and confess," and, "We reprobate and condemn." Or one limits the obligation to such doctrines and parts of doctrines as are to be regarded as the result of doctrinal disputes and as the final judgment of the Church on the same.

But he who says that he professes the Concordia, and then declares that he accepts it only in so far as it agrees with Scripture, makes his vow illusory by annulling the first in the second part of it, and at the same time calls into question clear doctrines of Scripture. He who says that he professes such doctrines of the symbols as may be shown to be decisions of the Church in doctrinal disputes, substitutes the Church for Scripture as the judge of doctrine, excludes clear doctrines of Scripture from his profession, violates the principle of Scripture, makes everything indefinite and uncertain, destroys the essence of confession, and frustrates the purpose of the symbols. Quatenus confessors lack the right use of reason as well as the right fidelity to confession and Scripture. The old unconditional commitment to the Lutheran confessional writings, i.e., to the entire doctrinal content of the same, because it agrees in all its parts with Scripture-it alone is this that comes into conflict neither with itself nor with Scripture. In any case, theologians who accept the confession only with reservations cannot be considered full Lutherans, but at best only Lutherans with restrictions and deductions, and this precisely because they are not devoted and devoted to Scripture in all its parts.

What is the position of the World Convention? Did it declare in its resolution that the whole doctrinal content of all Lutheran symbols is binding? D. Knubel seems to want to assert this, for he praises "the unfaltering devotion" of the World Convention also with reference to the confessional writings. How does the matter stand? The most influential Eisenach delegates from America were the representatives of the United Lutheran Church and the Augustana Synod. Were they to be expected to advocate a firm confessional position? Certainly, "the strict confessional loyalty" of the U. L. C. has been repeatedly emphasized by its own members, and again last year by Melhorn, the editor of the *Lutheran*. Similar claims for the Augustana Synod are made from time to time by the *Lutheran Companion,* the English organ of that Synod.

But the fact is, that in the U. L. C. the confession of all

from the beginning was in many respects not much more than a dead letter. It was precisely the U. L. C. D. Reu had in mind when he declared in Eisenach that the Iowa Synod was not in pulpit and altar fellowship "with those who refuse to take seriously also in this piece [rejection of the secus docentes] of the Reformation confession in church life." (L. u. W. 1923, 361.) Against the synods which now form the U. L. C., we Missourians have ever and ever had to make the charge of confessional laxism. The same accusation applies doubly to the Augustana Synod, and indeed, after its intercourse with Söderblom in the previous year, which denied all true Lutheranism. Prof. Sebelius from Rock Island in Eisenach also made the sad confession: "In our schools (of the Augustan Synod) the confessional basis had to be abandoned in many cases.

How carelessly the Augustan Synod treats the confessions is also evident from the fact that at this year's meeting in June, following the manner of the Methodists and other sects, it described every war par excellence "as a complete negation of all that Christianity stands for" and replaced the words "He descended into hell" (in the sense of the place of the damned) in the Apostolicum with "He descended into Hades" (in the sense of the place of the dead): "He descended into Hades" (in the sense of place of the dead). With reference to the last point, the *News Bulletin of* the N. L. C. says: "Upon recommendation of Dr. C. E. Lindberg, dean of Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, DI., synod voted to change the phrase in the Apostles' Creed relating to Christ's descent into hell to read: 'He descended into Hades.' Dr. Lindberg contended that the ancient rendering gives the impression that Christ descended into the place of the damned, 'which,' he declared, 'we [bie Reformed?] know is not true.'"

With the decision concerning the war, the Augustan Synod renounced the 16th article of the Augsburg Confession, according to which also "Christians may . . . wage right wars, quarrel (jure bellare, militare)," and with the Hades resolution it made a break with the ninth article of the Formula of Concord. It is also characteristic of the unionist spirit, which is becoming more and more widespread in this synod, that it has chosen its president Brandelle, who seems to be of one heart and soul with Söderblom, as a delegate for the unionist and political "World Conference on Life and Work" in Stockholm in August 1925, which was run by Söderblom. What could be expected in Eisenach from such indifferentist Lutherans for a decisive statement with regard to the Lutheran symbols?

As is well known, the situation is much sadder in this respect in the Lutheran national churches of Europe. How long has it been now, especially in Germany, where all the specifically Lutheran confessions have been

have their cradle, this delicious treasure under the pew in the dust! Just as there are relatively few theologians in the Lutheran Church in America who have publicly rejected the literal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, while in Germany almost no one, even among the denominationalists, wants to know anything about it, so too the Lutheran confession has sunk much lower in esteem over there and is far more out of use than is the case in any American synod.

Our readers will forgive us if we remind them once again of the words of Gußmann, "that, at least as far as Germany is concerned, there is hardly anything that has been so deeply pushed into the corner, misunderstood, disregarded, and set aside as the confession of the fathers. (L. u. W., p. 55.) Specifically of the Formula of Concord, it is said in Frank's Vademecum, published again last year by R. H. Grützmacher: "I am well aware that there are theologians who are overcome with goose bumps when even the name of the Formula of Concord is mentioned: it is the least read and best hated confession of our Church." (p. 161.) We would not be able to name a single living theologian in any German university who still held himself bound to the whole doctrinal content of the Concordia of 1580.

Even at Eisenach, where efforts were made to avoid differences as much as possible in order to preserve the appearance of Lutheran orthodoxy, it became clear enough that there was no question of real loyalty to the confession and unreserved acceptance of it among the great majority of the delegates. Jörgensen gave a lecture on "The Confession as the Indispensable Foundation of the Lutheran Church. In this lecture, however, the binding nature of the entire doctrinal content of the confessional writings was not only not known, but directly denied. Jörgensen declared, "Not all the confessions of our church have equal importance; there are mobilia and immobilia." "While the Apostolic is thoroughly immobilia, the Formula of Concord belongs to the mobilia."

It is obvious that by these sentences the Concordia is dismissed as a really valid and binding creed. What can be built on quicksand, for which mobile is but another name? Can anyone be trusted who declares the doctrinal content of the confessions to which he is committed to be mobilia, things with respect to which he reserves the freedom to change them? Nothing was materially improved in this state of affairs by the fact that Jörgensen, in the lecture printed in the "A. E. L. K.," thus rendered the above second sentence: "The Apostolic is the thoroughly immobile, while in the Formula of Concord we find mobilia." The meaning remains the same: Only the Apostolicum is binding in all its parts, but in the other symbols, especially in the Formula of Concord, doctrinal changes are not excluded.

We Missourians say with the Lutheran Church: All the doctrines of our Confessions are divine truths revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and as such are something inviolable, unchangeable, permanent, and universally and ever valid. They are the right immobilia, which never change, but stand, fixed, even when heaven and earth pass away. As unchangeable divine values, these doctrines are therefore also permanently binding and must always and everywhere be accepted in faith by theologians and laymen alike, held fast unchanged, and confessed in accordance with their place and time. And to confess them according to the time and place does not mean to change them according to the wrong views and philosophies of the different peoples, countries and times, but to assert them against them and to overcome all the conflicting errors of the time through them.

But Jörgensen thinks quite differently. Like all modern developmental theologians who have abandoned the principle of Scripture, which alone leads to certain truth, the doctrines of the Confession are nothing more than unfinished human attempts that never reach their goal and conclusion, never reach dogmatic peace and certainty, something that is always in the process of becoming, always in flux, always in the process of passing through to something other than it is now - mobilia, perpetua mobilia. Concerning the doctrines of confession, Jörgensen says: "The mobilia are the theological formulations; they are always in motion, in order to show each generation the way to God." It is a matter, he said, of "preserving the immobilia, of carrying on the mobilia in keeping with the times." In his lecture Jörgensen wanted to prove that the confession was the indispensable foundation of the Lutheran church. But if his doctrine of mobilia is correct, he has proved that there is not and cannot be such a foundation at all, and that commitment to the Confession is as immoral as it is foolish and contradictory. For to commit oneself to a perpetuum mobile, to a creed whose doctrines are always to be remodelled and carried on anew, of which, therefore, one does not know today what it may become tomorrow, is just as incompatible with truthfulness as with reasonableness.

What Jörgensen presented with regard to the Confession was nothing new for the European delegates, especially the German delegates. He was only "reproducing" what the theologians at Leipzig, Erlangen and other universities had been advocating for more than seventy-five years. Agreeing with Jörgensen, D. Bachmann-Erlangen: "In the lectures and in the debate it had clearly emerged that the will to confess was strong and growing everywhere in our church. This observation is also true for Germany. . . Admittedly, it must also be said that serious problems are also contained in the conceptual connections between theology and confession, confession and ministry, confessions and confession.

be. . . .. The speaker [Jörgensen] was right to draw the distinction between immobilia and mobilia in the Confession; to draw the line between the two, therein lies the difficulty. The congregation of believers must have an understanding of this situation."

"The will to confess" - Jörgensen took up this phrase and declared in his "closing words" that this unanimous will to confess (i.e. not the confession itself!) was "the basis for our unification". Even the Convention as such did not consider it necessary to voice dissent. Yes, even the theologians of the U. L. C. took no offence at the distinction between mobilia unb immobilia. Even after the Convention, Melhorn wrote in the *Lutheran* with reference to the subject treated by Jörgensen: "All that was spoken rang true to that proposition." In this way Melhorn professes the doctrine of mobilia advocated by Jörgensen and Bachmann, which nevertheless surrenders the confession to the arbitrariness of theologians and dispenses with the permanent binding force of its entire doctrinal content.

But even delegates who disagreed with Jörgensen were not lacking in Eisenach. It is misleading when Melhorn, referring to the discussion on the Confession, remarks: "There was manifest at that conference a common faith-consciousness, which bound together in a holy alliance the representative units of twenty-two countries". (L. & W., p. 87.) More than on any other occasion, rather, the disunity here clearly appeared. Prof. Sebelius, of Rock Island, in his correlation, declared: "But I wish on this occasion also to emphasize the Formula of Concord, and to testify my respect for this confessional writing, even if it should be reckoned among the 'mobilia,' as D. Jörgensen has done. On this point I cannot entirely agree with the esteemed speaker." Sebelius completely broke off the top of this criticism, which was already weak in itself, by the concession "that among good Lutherans there are also honest differences of opinion about the relative value of the individual confessions," as well as by the confession already mentioned: "In our schools [the Augustana Synod] the confessional basis had to be abandoned in many cases."

D. Reu rightly emphasized the need to be clear about the content as well as the scope of the confession. He said: "That the Lutheran Church can be held together by nothing other than the bond of the common confession is a truth that cannot be overemphasized. But equally important is the other, that one must be clear about the content and scope of that confession. For me and for the Lutheran Synod of Iowa, which I represent here, the Concordia of 1580 is the confession in which we know ourselves to be one by virtue of its conformity to Scripture, and in which we have not only a historical witness to the faith, but also a confession of faith in which we know ourselves to be one.

We would put "doctrinal statements" for "doctrinal statements," since the former expression would be understood as a limitation of the binding doctrinal content of the symbols. (L. u. W. 1923, p. 360.) For "statements of faith" we would substitute doctrinal statements, since one would like to understand the former expression as a limitation of the binding doctrinal content of the symbols.

There was also no lack of opposition among the German representatives. Dr. D. Schinkel of Hamburg said, "Permit me, as a so-called layman, in the interest of the congregations I represent, also to take up a lance for a full, unabridged confession." "Who dares . . to want to take away or slacken even one iota of our Lutheran confession of faith?" To the congregations, he declared, "the sanctity of the confession of faith of all those who wish to bear the name 'Lutheran' so dearly beloved by us should be emphasized over and over again." Whether, however, D. Schinkel meant the entire doctrinal content of the symbols, of which not one iota was to be allowed to diminish, and whether, with reference to the same, no exceptional position, no undue liberties, were to be allowed to the theologians, is not clear from the report before us. Baron D. Pechmann declared that he agreed with D. Schinkel.

As is well known, the Lutheran Federation is also regarded as a standing protest against the general laxism with regard to the confessional position in the regional churches. That this is true in some respects was shown by the debates of its representatives, D. Amelung of Dresden saying, among other things: "If we want to become better Lutherans, then this can only mean: the Lutheran confession must become more and more fully effective in us personally as well as in our church." The confession must dominate "the entire life of our church, its worship, its constitution." "The Lutheran Confession does not want to be merely tolerated, but wants to rule, to dominate the life of the whole church." Superintendent Anthes thus concurred, "If the Confession is the indispensable foundation of the Lutheran Church, it must also be given full effect in its life. The recent development of the Lutheran Church in Germany (and in many other countries it will be similar, I do not know exactly) shows many compromises in the position towards the Confession. What is said in the preface of many Lutheran regional churches about the confession bears the character of compromise. . . . And still more does the character of compromise show itself in the practical assertion of the confession. It is a terrible damage which many Lutheran brethren in the national churches feel, that in one and the same pulpit confessionally and unconfessionally can be preached. I do not say this in order to judge, but out of deep sorrow, because I see how the congregations are suffering.

confuses and destroys the Lutheran church. It must be a task of the Lutheran World Convention to work to ensure that the confession really forms the essential basis, not only for the individual Lutheran, not only for Lutheran groups, but for the church." The position, however, that the entire symbolic doctrinal content is binding for theologians as well as for laymen, does not seem to be shared by the members of the Lutheran Federation. At any rate, this was not clearly expressed in the debates. And yet this very question should have formed a main point of the negotiations. For as long as it remains open what is actually binding in the confession, basically nothing firm and definite has been achieved.

Superintendent Angerstein from Lodz struck the right note against the indifferentism always associated with a lax position on symbols, which also prevailed in Eisenach. He exhorted the World Convention to a more zealous use and study of the Bible, the symbolic books, the Lutheran edification literature and the writings of Luther. Jörgensen had said in his lecture: "A fusion with other denominations is impossible, the basic views are too different; but cooperation is possible." Angerstein, on the other hand, said that the symbolic books "should be read and the rejection of those who teach differently (improbant secus docentes) should be taken up again; that would be better than the many union-making activities under the appearance of love. Yes, it is precisely the activity of love that has always been put at the service of false doctrine and unionism. It is well known how the Roman Church, which is now feverishly endeavoring as never before to bring into being a mighty counter-reformation in all Protestant countries, uses its charity and charitable institutions as bait and means of seduction. The same is true of the American sects, which place their "gifts of love" for Europe in the service of their enthusiasm and soul-catching, in order especially to plunder the German national churches and to rob them of their best members. Love activity in the service of lies and seduction, however, is nothing other than masked enemy cunning. One of the purposes of the World Convention was to counter this mischievous propaganda of the papists and sects. Unfortunately, however, the World Convention itself has not kept itself free from the abuse of love for the promotion of God-opposing purposes, especially indifferentism and unionism. In place of the old fidelity to faith, doctrine, and confession, it too has substituted works of love. "The best propaganda for our confession," Jörgensen declared, "is love-and are works of love." Doctrinal unity, most thought, was not so important to Lutheranism, and doctrinal differences could be overlooked as long as only the bond of quite a few works of love bound them together, or as the Iowasche "Kirchenblatt," describing the situation in Eisenach, put it: "Unity in doctrine is not necessary if one does only common works of love."

Against this abuse of the activity of love for the seduction into error, especially for the propaganda of indifferentism and unionism, and thus for the undermining of the firm position on the symbols, Angerstein directed himself, as follows: "One wants today to blur the dogmatic foundation with the works of love and to achieve a generous fraternization." Against this, however, Luther wrote: "Some unintelligent spirits pretend that one should not quarrel so harshly about one article, but whether one is mistaken in a small part, since one is otherwise one in others, one may well give way a little and at the same time keep brotherly and Christian unity. No, dear man; it is not a matter of yielding, not of conceding something for your sake or for the sake of some people, but of yielding all things to the word, whether it be enemy or friend. For it is not given for the sake of outward or worldly concord and peace, but for the sake of eternal life. The word and the doctrine are to make Christian unity and fellowship; where they are of the same mind, the other will well follow; but where they are not, there remains no unity. Therefore tell me of no love nor friendship, where one will break off from the word or faith; for not love, but the word brings eternal life, God's grace, and all heavenly treasures."

This glorious Luther word expresses precisely the truth that was timely and necessary at Eisenach in the discussion about the right position on the confession and also in other ways - at Eisenach, where, as I said, a community of love without true unity in doctrine and practice was substituted for the right faith, doctrinal and confessional fidelity. But as reason cannot and must not take the place of Scripture, so also love can never and never take the place of faith. By love and its works no one becomes a Christian. Nor does it bring about the unity of the church, which is precisely the unity of faith. Faith alone makes one a Christian, and it alone brings all Christians into unity and fellowship; it alone makes one a member of the church. By the works of charity, the unity of faith, wherever it exists, is only actuated. And this activity of love is only true, genuine and pleasing to God when it flows from the right faith and the fellowship in the same and therefore also happens in the interest of the right confession and the spreading of the same.

It was only a small minority that contradicted Jörgensen at Eisenach. And even these did not all stand up for the full Lutheran truth. The World Convention should and must have done justice to this situation, if it wanted to come to a confessional resolution at all. But this could only be done by rejecting the doctrine of mobility and by a decisive confession of the Lutheran position that the entire doctrinal content of all Lutheran symbols is binding until the Last Day. The

Circumstances demanded a clear testimony to the stability and immutability of the doctrines of the Confession, precisely because they are doctrines of Scripture. From the outset it was certain that the adoption of a resolution which failed here could only be regarded as tantamount to denial of the truth, which must be confessed according to the existing opposition.

What about the resolution that was adopted? The fact that it avoids the question of the inspiration of Holy Scripture was pointed out in the previous issue of Doctrine and Discipline. Does it strike a truly contemporary note regarding the Confession? The resolution was unanimously adopted by Lutherans of all persuasions who had gathered for the World Convention, including Jörgensen and Bachmann and all who shared their lax views, even such spirits as Söderblom and Kaftan. 1) A good prejudice

1) Theodor Kaftan, formerly General Superintendent in Schleswig-Holstein, now pastor of the Free Church congregation in Baden-Baden, was repeatedly mentioned years ago in "Lehre und Wehre". In our articles on the World Convention he is often mentioned in connection with Söderblom. That no injustice is done to him when he is placed in the same category as the liberal Swede is also proved by the "Freikirche" (No. 1, 11 and 12). In 1908 Kaftan published a booklet of "Biblical Questions of Time and Controversy," entitled: "The Man Jesus Christ the Some Mediator Between God and Men." Here it says: "Mediator between God and men is the man Jesus Christ. Mediator, not God, that is the bottom line." Four times at the beginning of ever new paragraphs Kaftan emphasizes, "Christ is the mediator, not God." Further, "Our prayer is not to the Son of Man, but to the God revealed and graciously turned to us in the Son of Man; there is but one God, and every prayer addressed to another borders on idolatrous courses." Kaftan further speaks of the "cult of Christ, - which does not deny a certain likeness to the cult of Mary in the Roman Church." (P. 4. 33.) Kaftan "strikes down the deity of the Mediator of Jesus with all definiteness," was also D. Schäders' judgment in a review of Kaftan's pamphlet. In "Modern Theology of the Old Faith," Kaftan writes: "We must break with the delusion, as if it were fidelity against the old faith, to drag all the human things with which ever and ever per old faith intertwined itself." (121 f.) "They [the "ancient theologians of the Orient"] interpreted the godly mystery which is in Christ in the forms of thought of their day. The Greeks, in order to proclaim man to the natives from the Father, utilized the deepest speculations of their race." (118.) "From the ["Saul armor of ancient theology" with its "old theological propositions"] we must get rid." Further, "I reject the designation of the sonship of Jesus to God as a metaphysical one, but expressly for this reason, lest the fact of revelation should enter into the light of a speculative product." Kaftan also rejects the "pre-existence of Jesus, as if there were three times for the Jesus Christ of our faith, an infinite time before the Incarnation, a finite time in the days of His flesh, and again an infinite time after His resurrection." Further, "What is not to me . . . certain is

This circumstance does not, in any case, create a problem for the resolution; for, as far as is known, not a single one of them has changed his previous position in any way.

As already noted, the resolution, taken in and of itself, contains nothing wrong, not even with reference to the Lutheran confession. But it does not do justice to the situation in Eisenach. What it should have confessed and expressed clearly, it conceals and avoids. Precisely what could not be missing under the present circumstances is not to be found in it. The resolution reads: "The Lutheran World Convention . . . sees in the confession of the Lutheran Church, especially in the unaltered Augsburg Confession .

the virgin birth, and that merely because, apart from the infancy narrative, the whole New Testament, including Matthew and Luke, knows nothing of such. What seems to imply the same, and what seems to exclude the same, entirely balance each other." (29.) But even to a caftan something which is not certain to him (in this case the virgin birth) cannot be considered a Christian doctrine. Who also would accept miracles which he could not clearly prove from Scripture! What "matters" in the resurrection of Jesus, says Kaftan, is "not the manner in which the transition from death to life took place, whether this transition took place in a peculiar resuscitation of the body lying in the grave, or in some new incarnation of the one who died". (33.) For his own part, says Kaftan, he rejects the latter view; the old belief, however, "we cannot and must not deny to the representatives of the objective vision hypothesis" [according to which the body of Christ decayed and did not rise, and the disciples saw only a "God-worked face"]. Page 37 s. Kaftan gives a summary of what he regards as "the essentials" of the old faith. In it the clear confession of the Trinity, of the divinity of Christ, of the virgin birth, of the resurrection of Christ with his body from the dead, of vicarious satisfaction, of the return of Christ to judgment, and of the resurrection of the flesh is missing. Whoever, especially in such writings as Kaftan's, does not confess the above truths roundly and clearly to the modern liberal errors, must not complain if he is counted among the liberals, where, according to the above quotations, Kaftan also placed himself. In the February issue of "Immanuel" of this year, however, Kaftan complains that he is counted among the liberals, asserting: "The denial of the deity of Jesus Christ is far from me." The "Free Church" is in the right when it demands a retraction of his false propositions and a clear confession of the truths he denies. Experience throughout the world has taught us that the words of liberals are too often not to be trusted. But Kaftan does not think of recanting. In the "A. E. L. K." of June 20, Kaftan mentions his writing. "Even the 'Modern Theology of the Old Faith,'" he writes, "was by no means dismissed a limine there [in America]; an ecclesiastical journal, I mean: of the General Synod of that day, carried it in English in a lengthy extract." Of any retraction or correction of his statements, however, there is nothing to be read in the "A. E. L. K."

Confession and in Luther's Small Catechism, the fair rendering of the Word of God." If one looks at the delegates, Lutherans of all stripes, who would unanimously adopt this resolution, the question suggests itself whether by the expression "Confession of the Lutheran Church" all the confessional writings of the Concordia of 1580, including the Formula of Concord, are meant; further, whether the opinion is that all the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism are doctrines of the Word of God, or only that God's Word is to be found in the same; whether by the word "in particular" a distinction is to be made between the confessions in such a way that the ones mentioned are a louder, but the others a less louder rendering of the Word of God; whether, finally, by the expression "Lutheran World Convention" it is also to be said that the confessional doctrines are binding not only on pastors, laymen, and congregations, but in quite the same way also on the theologians at the universities.

What we miss above all in the resolution is the Lutheran judgment with reference to the error of the mobility of the symbols and their doctrines, which is rampant everywhere in world Lutheranism and was publicly advocated in Eisenach. Why has not testimony been given in the confessional resolution to the truth that all the doctrines of all the Lutheran confessions are nothing but a faithful and consistently correct reproduction and exposition of the eternally unchangeable teachings of Holy Scripture? Had it been desired to confess according to the existing contrast, the resolution would have been given a form something like the following: The Lutheran World Convention confesses all Lutheran confessional writings, including the Formula of Concord (Concordia of 1580), because their entire doctrinal content is taken from Holy Scripture and agrees with it, and is thus nothing other than unchanging divine truth itself. If one wished to be quite sure, one would have added that this doctrinal content, precisely because it is nothing other than the clear teaching of Scripture, binds not only the laity and congregations with their preachers and teachers, not only ecclesiastical assemblies such as conferences, synods, and world conventions, but especially also the theological professors and faculties at the universities with all theological assemblies.2) Such a clear, contemporary position

2) Even Gußmann seems to be of the opinion that an "ecclesiastical assembly" like the World Convention differs from a "theological congress" in that the latter has "its point of unity" "in this or that theological doctrine" [according to which, as is well known, modern theologians see their issue in re-modeling the doctrines of Scripture and confession according to their extra-biblical heritage principle, i. e., to false], the former, on the other hand, seek their "point of unity" "in the faith and confession of the church, which is true to the Scriptures." (L. u. W., p. 96.) Characteristic of the megalomania of such theologians, who exalt themselves above plain Christians, who accept the word of Scripture with simple-minded faith,

However, Eisenach did not want this opinion. The above-mentioned debates, some of which were aimed in this direction, were ignored. If, by adopting such a resolution, some of the European leaders of the World Convention in particular had broken the baton over their own Lutheranism, put a stop to all their unconfessional theology and dealt the death blow to the idol of modern theologians, "free science and research", which does not want to know anything about bondage (but thereby falls into the bondage of its own thought constructs).

It follows from this situation that we Missourians, had we been represented at Eisenach, would not have been able to cast our vote in favor of the confessional resolution in fellowship with the delegates of the World Convention. We would have felt that this was an actual denial of the very truths that had to be made known at Eisenach. We would have made the false concession that one could be satisfied with a conditional acceptance of the doctrines of the Confession, and that such a position was not contrary to the unity of faith and church fellowship. We have also helped to create the untrue appearance that the World Convention is united on the confessional question, that it has taken a correct position with regard to the symbols, that it has documented its unfaltering devotion to the confessions (as the adoption of the confessional resolution has been interpreted), even the pretense that we too would have come to an understanding and found a modus vivendi with theologians such as Jörgensen, Bachmann, and the moderns of all who seek to make our glorious Confession, which has hitherto remained unshaken despite all enemies, into a wavering reed and perpetual motion machine. We should rather have demanded that the Convention confess the whole doctrinal content of the Concordia of 1580, and that without any ambiguity,

The only thing that seems so exalted to me is the proud way in which Kahnis once dismissed D. Münkel when the latter had dared to reproach the Erlangen and Leipzig theologians for their apostasy from Scripture and the Lutheran confession. "If Father Münkel," wrote Kahnis, "cannot tolerate the heights where avalanches and boulders fall, let him stay on the Lüneburg heath with the heidschnucken, tending bees and raising asparagus." (Cf. Pieper, Dogm. I, 62.) But in the whole universe nothing is so great as to rise above God's Word and the doctrines of the Lutheran Confession taken from the same. Whatever wonders of learning Kahnis and his colleagues may have been, the greatness which he presumed over Münkel was only present in his imagination. Theologians who would have us believe that, unlike ordinary Christians who believe the word, they have recognized Christian doctrines as necessary truths, and have thus elevated faith to knowledge, are not to be taken seriously. They give more than they have. Childlike faith in the authoritative word of Scripture is and remains for theologians as well as for plain Christians the way which alone leads to certainty with reference to Christian truths.

to plug up all the loopholes for all the wrong spirits. Any formula that would have failed here, we would have refused our consent. And this precisely to the end, in order to create full clarity, to confirm our testimony for the truth by deed, and not to leave the impression that finally we too would not refuse at least the tolerari potest to a quateness to the symbols. Truthfulness also demands that we seriously avoid everything that creates false ideas in others about our own opinion and position. F. B.

(To be continued.)

Literature.

Christian Dogmatics. By D. Franz Pieper. 1st vol. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. XII and 690 pages 6X9.' $5.00.

A few remarks should be added here to the announcements in the main edition of this journal about this first volume of the "Christian Dogmatics" by D. Franz Pieper, with which the entire great work is now completed. The title "Christian Dogmatics" is extremely appropriate, for the doctrines presented here are not the author's own speculations and constructions, but the one most holy Christian faith, which God Himself has given once and for all to all Christians of all times, without compromises and without human ingredients. It is the ecumenical doctrines which all Christians applaud, if not always explicate in all particulars, yet implicite and consequential, if not always publicly before men, yet before God, if in all points not fully here on earth, yet in eternity. The attribute "Christian" appears particularly puffing also inasmuch as here the fundamental tones, by which Christian truth differs from all philosophical and heathen doctrines, recur again and again: sola Scriptura, sola gratia, propter Christum, sola fide, soli Deo gloria, and especially the sanctuary in the holy of holies, the substitutionary atonement through the blood of JEsu Christ, the Son of God.

But one will not read long in this Dogmatics without saying to oneself (and the longer one reads, the more): the title could also have been "Biblical Dogmatics". This is not merely because the doctrines set forth in it are Scriptural doctrines and agree with Scripture, but also because they are all substantiated with Scriptural passages, and that in a manner as clear and simple as it is convincing and copious. We could not name any recent dogmatics in which the principle of Scripture itself is presented in such detail on all sides, and in which the proof of Scripture for the individual doctrines is presented so carefully, accurately, concisely, and yet at the same time comprehensively, as is the case here. Even in the Lutheran Church there are theologians who, like the Reformed, profess the Scriptures in theory, but deny them in practice in their treatment of the individual doctrines. Scripture, however, does not want to be merely quoted, but properly quoted and utilized. Whether a dogmatics is truly Scriptural is determined not by the Scripture section alone, but by the actual use of Scripture in the individual doctrines. The present dogmatics not only takes a correct principled stand on Scripture, but also consistently brings the Scriptural principle to full bear in its treatment of the individual doctrines.

Furthermore, one does not read long in this work without saying to oneself: the title could also have been "Lutheran Dogmatics". For the theology presented here is nothing other than the theology of Luther. Its doctrines are the doctrines, taken from Scripture, of the Lutheran Confessions and of all faithful Lutheran theologians, preachers, and churches. Through carefully selected

In many places of this dogmatics the proof is given by quotations, especially from Luther and the symbols. Objectively, the expression "Lutheran dogmatics" does not differ from "Christian" or "biblical" dogmatics. Lutheran means neither a plus nor a minus for "Christian" or "biblical. Lutheran dogmatics does not contain the Christian, biblical truths with the addition of some doctrines invented by the Lutheran church, but nothing but the ancient Christian, biblical doctrines brought to light again by Luther. It is a fundamental error if, since the time of dogma formation theory, the matter has often been presented as if Luther had invented something hitherto new in Christianity and also not given in Scripture, or, as one might well express it, had given the Gospel an absolutely new interpretation. Luther only brought the old doctrine of Christ back to light and placed it on the lampstand. A truly Lutheran dogmatics is therefore nothing other than a genuinely Christian or biblical dogmatics. If it is not biblical, it is not Lutheran. Christian, biblical, Lutheran - these are interchangeable terms. Because the dogmatics before us is consistently scriptural, and therefore also confessional, it is Lutheran and could bear the title "Lutheran Dogmatics.

Whoever reads D. Pieper's Dogmatics attentively cannot fail to notice that the doctrines as they are presented and treated here are no other than the very truths which have been taught for more than eighty years in the Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, which the Missouri Synod has advocated from the very beginning until the present day, and which can be found in all its schools, papers, reports and books, especially also in this journal, which is now in its seventieth year. "Missourian Dogmatics"-therefore the title of this work could not have been inaccurate or untimely. Miffourian does not mean, as some might think, Christian + Lutheran + Missourian, but nothing more and nothing less than Lutheran, and therefore nothing more and nothing less than Christian, biblical. A "Missourian" dogmatics could not divide its content into Christian doctrines, specifically Lutheran doctrines, and special doctrines of Walther, because, unlike Christian, biblical doctrines, there are neither specifically Lutheran doctrines nor also Missourian special doctrines. A Lutheran doctrine of faith is nothing other than, as it were, an unchanged re-presentation of Pauline, biblical theology. And so also a correct exposition of the Missourian doctrines, such as we have before us in this Dogmatics, is nothing but an unchanged reprint of the old Lutheran theology in contrast to the many counterfeited, mutilated, and interpolated editions of Lutheranism in modern theology. What is not biblical is not Lutheran. Anyone can convince themselves of this from the Lutheran symbols. From the very beginning, Missouri has also wanted to be nothing but biblical, Lutheran. Of doctrines that go beyond the Scriptures and contradict the Confession, we want to know nothing. If anyone could prove with reference to any doctrine in our Scriptures that it is not in accordance with Scripture and the Confession, we would be the first to reject it. That this is the position of Missouri can be ascertained by everyone from her writings, and nowhere more easily and convincingly than from the dogmatics of D. Pieper.

Many misleading things have been written about what is taught in Missouri, especially in St. Louis Seminary, and how it has always been taught. It has even been claimed that the Missourians are not really Scripture theologians, but only Reprobationary and Fathers' theologians. Whoever would like to inform himself quickly and reliably about this, should study the work of D. Pieper, who has been active as a teacher of dogmatics at the seminary in St. Louis for more than forty years. Here he will find what Missouri teaches and has ever taught, how it argues and proves its doctrines, how it bases everything on Scripture, also how it utilizes Luther, the Confessions, and the dogmatists. How it teaches here and operates with Scripture, the Confessions, and Luther, is how our fathers did it more than eighty years ago, especially D. Walther. From the very beginning Missouri has fought the modern doctrinal development and dogma theory. This dogmatic theory, too, sees in the Christian doctrines not mobilia, but fixed quantities which neither change nor increase nor diminish. That Missouri does not develop new doctrines in the lull of time

The fact that the Church has not changed but has remained what it was from the beginning is proved most conclusively by this very dogmatics, for its doctrines are the same as those advocated by our Fathers.

Characterizing their theology, theologians in the Middle Ages said: Credo, quia intelligo. But he who wants to believe only what he sees, what he understands and recognizes as true with his reason, is a rationalist, as our liberals are today. Others have said, Credo, ut intelligam. But as every Christian, so also the theologian is bound to the authoritative word of Scripture, which he can always accept and recognize as true only by faith. Theologians, therefore, who imagine that they can recognize the simple Christian faith with their reason as a necessary truth of reason and thus elevate it to knowledge, are moving in the wrong direction and are heading toward rationalism, as the conservative scientific theologians, especially in Germany, have been doing for years. Still others have said: Credo, quia absurdum est. Although there are many things in the Christian faith that reason cannot understand, Christians and theologians believe these things not because they are absurd and contradictory, but because God's Word teaches them, because they are written in Scripture. Credo, quia scriptum est, this is the right slogan, as it was issued by Christ and the apostles, and excepted again by Luther. The right tyeology and church says: We believe everything that is written, even if it seems absurd and contradictory to reason, and that precisely because it is written, because it is God's Word written in Scripture. This is also the position of this dogmatics, as decided as it is consistently carried through. "It is written"-therewith everything is decided for them. Not human views about God are offered here, but real theology, the teaching about God and His work, which God Himself has given us in His Word.

Modern theologians (Schleiermacher, Hofmann, Frank) approach Scripture with a ready-made, self-made system of thought to show that the teachings of Scripture can be fitted into their system. Thereby it goes according to the rhyme: "Wilt thou that we build thee into the house, Let it please thee, stone, that we hew thee." This dogmatism of Pieper's is quite different. While the moderns close off Scripture from the outset by their false interests, she is everywhere open to Scripture. She does not approach Scripture with any ready-made, circumscribed thoughts to which Scripture would only have to say yes. Rather, it wants only the thoughts and teachings of Scripture, and that in the form and relative position to one another which they have in Scripture itself. It does not want to tell Scripture what it has to say, but to hear what it says and to say what it hears from Scripture.

For a theology that still wants to be scriptural theology at all, this method of simple Christianity is obviously the only correct and reasonable one. Even theologians of such intellectual caliber as Hofmann and Frank would not need long to prove this, if they were not blinded by their scientific conceit born of original sin. It is the same madness, after all, as if someone, in order to ascertain what Augustin or Luther or Spinoza teaches, first wanted to cobble together his own doctrinal edifice, in order then to approach these authors for their approval and, since they are no longer alive, to dissuade and force such from their writings. If such theologians do not wish to renounce reason, nor to be guilty of fraus pia, they must either bid farewell to their method, or drop the claim that they still find scriptural theologians at all. In such constructions only their own vanity and idolatrous after-worship can delight. What Christians want to know is not: What does a Schleiermacher, Hofmann, or Frank dream? but: What does God say in His Word? What do the Scriptures teach? How is it written? It is just such Christian questions that are the focus of D. Pieper's Dogmatics. This also makes the reading of it a spiritual pleasure and profit.

It is clear from what has been said that this dogmatics does not ignore the antitheses. It does not avoid the errors and especially the attacks of the opponents, but deals with them thoroughly. Bitter truths have often had to be told in the process; but criticism remains objective, fortiter in re, suaviter in modo. In particular

this volume goes sharply into court with the modern "ictheologians" who deny the inerrancy of Scripture and replace the Lutheran principle of Scripture with so-called Christian experience, Christian consciousness or the Christian ego, thus forming a kind of half-way house between Luther's
tum and liberalism. It is shown how a theology that wants to be both confessional and scientific at the same time not only denies Scripture and confession, but also everywhere comes into contradiction with itself. Scripture and reason are two masters whom no one can serve at the same time. A theology that does not base itself solely on the word of Scripture, but rather wants to be scientific, autonomous, free and unbound (which it is not and cannot be according to its nature), leads itself ad absurdum, makes a mockery of itself and only brings itself into disrepute and contempt.

Even such catchwords as "intellectualism," "dogmatism," "repristination," "unscientific," etc., with which the moderns conveniently seek to render their opponents harmless, are duly illuminated, whereby it then as a rule turns out that they fall back on the head of those who hurl these boomerangs. In other respects, too, the unworthy and untrue, especially in the struggle of the moderns against the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, are duly pilloried, e.g., the false assertion that Luther took a freer stand on Scripture, and that the verbal inspiration was an invention of the later dogmatists.

Luther says, "If you have God's Word, you are quite strong and firm, that you may well remain unruffled, come the devil or his messengers." God's Word is what Pieper's dogmatics is based on. And so it is also easy for her to overturn the proud and seemingly firmly established edifice of the scientific theologians with a few deft pushes. From the very beginning Missouri did not let herself be impressed by the so-called "theological science". Nor does the criticism of it in this Dogmatics help to raise respect for that theology. Whoever reads it will no longer believe in the spiritual superiority of these theologians who are proud of their knowledge.

Gußmann writes in the January issue of the "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt": "A theology of Christ, such as the Americans cultivate, based on the fundamental premise of verbal inspiration, is not at all present in Germany." A sadder testimony cannot be exhibited to Luther's country and people. Praise God, in America this theology has not yet died out! What is no longer present in Germany we have again in this dogmatics of D. Pieper, in which nothing is subjective and modernly scientifically oriented, but everything is built upon the clear word of Scripture. That is why this dogmatic is at the same time an enormous call to a movement away from all modernism, back to Scripture and the Lutheran confession. Yes, back to theology based on the infallible word of inerrant Scripture - that is the only contemporary slogan for our progress-drunk, development-addicted, subjectivistic, rationalistic time.

But how can the moderns go back? Gußmann says, "We cannot turn the wheel of history backwards! Our goal lies before us, not behind us." This is true insofar as, however, even the moderns are unable to free themselves from the web of lies in which they are entangled by their own reason and strength. But with God no thing is impossible. He can let the sun stand still and turn back its hand wherever and whenever he wants. Thus God can still convert whom he wills. He is also able to give modern theologians grace to return to the Scriptures and to confession. But what God gives, and what he alone can give, he also wants to be asked for. And like every true conversion, this return would in reality also be a true forward movement towards a goal that in truth lies before us and not behind us, a redeeming escape from the slavery of one's own delusions and tied-up systems - out into the open where the fresh air of the Word of God and objective truth blows. Progress is progress, after all, only when it is in the right direction. Daily repentance, penance and return, which also includes constant turning away from one's own theological ideas and constant conversion and return to Scripture, to the Word of Scripture - this alone is right, true progress in theology.

But this right-wing progress has so far been rejected by the moderns. From

They do not want to know anything about a return to Scripture and confession. "Modern theology," says D. Pieper (p. 187), "has lost Christian knowledge to the extent that it considers the return to Scripture as God's Word a misfortune to be fought with might." And yet there is no other progress, no other salvation for them than this very return from the cave of their own false thoughts and dreams into the realm of objective truth in the clear Word of Scripture. The truth in the clear word of Scripture - we stick to that, for with it stands and falls all that we believe and hope. The truth in the clear word of Scripture - that is what we also owe to the moderns again and again. To the end we would like to see in the hands of all theologians also this dogmatics of Pieper. It will strengthen all faithful theologians of Scripture in their struggle against the attacks on the foundation of their faith. Others, infected by modern subjectivism, would benefit from a serious study of it. And even in those who do not yet wish to be freed from their unbelief, the reading of them would leave thorns of truth from which they could not so easily free themselves. Yes, what a gain for theology and the church if this dogmatics were studied thoroughly and seriously everywhere, especially also in Luther's country! May God bestow His blessing on the glorious work of D. Pieper! F. B.

The Twins. A story for children. By *Marg. Lenk*. Translated from the German by *Louis P. Lochner*. Published and printed by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Germany. 75 cts. Qu beaiepen bont Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

We are glad that more and more of Lenk's stories are being translated into English. They nourish the Christian mind, increase Christian knowledge, deepen Christian insight, and sharpen Christian judgment. Wherever they turn in and are read, there they leave a blessing. The translation reads smoothly. Only here and there does one stop a little, e. g., at the word "wax-cloth." F. B.

Roughing It for Christ in the Wilds of Brazil. By Albert Lehenbauer. Published by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Germany. To be obtained from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. or from Rev. E. C. Wegehaupt, Chatham, Ill. 15 Cts.

This is the second, revised and enlarged edition of the extremely captivating book which we already published last year. It is a vivid reminder of Wyneken's missionary work and bears witness to the fact that, praise God, his spirit and willingness to sacrifice have not died out in our midst. We still have sons who prove worthy of our fathers in all things. Nor is their number small; for to what Father Lehenbauer here describes, many analogues might be supplied from our own West, from Canada, China, etc. They are heroes of Christ - God bless and protect them! F. B.

A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, has sent us issue 5 of the "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift" and issue 5 of the "Theologie der Gegenwart". The first issue contains the following articles: "Kant's Bicentennial" by D. Girgensohn, "Zeitgemäße Randbemerkungen zu den Artikeln VII und VIII der Augustana" by D. Haack, "Wissenschaftliche Exegese und erbauliche Schriftauslegung" by D. Nägelsbach. Booklet 5 of "Theologie der Gegenwart" gives a brief overview of the most recent literature in the field of pedagogy and edification and entertainment literature. Issue 6 of the "N. K. Z." with an article by D. Kegel on the question: "Where did Israel sacrifice to its God?" and a continuation of Nägelsbach's work. Issue 6 of the "Th. d. G." with a review of recent Old Testament literature by D. E. Sellin-Berlin, who himself can hardly be considered more conservative. F. B.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

D. Phil. Heinrich Ebeling died in Dresden on January 21 of this year at the age of 83 years and 3 months. The report says: "He was, as a man of unusual talent, not only known as a scholar of general scientific interest, but also in financial circles as a good German and also as a resolute Christian and Lutheran in the old, true sense of the word. For decades he and his wife, with whom he lived in a childless marriage, had no fixed abode, but changed it according to the seasons between Berlin, Dresden, Wiesbaden, Freiburg i. Br. etc. up to Florence, Rome, Naples, everywhere making extensive use of the libraries. He was closely connected with the 'Reichsbote', whose reader he remained until the end of his life, already from its foundation, namely also as a personal friend of P. Heinrich Engels. For many years Ebeling had remained completely indifferent to everything concerning spiritual and eternal things. Then he came to the point that he said to himself that as a sensible and educated man he should read and study the Bible thoroughly, just as he had read the books of other writers. And the Holy Spirit, who rules in the Holy Scriptures and speaks through them, seized his soul and brought him not only to faith in general, but also to orthodoxy in all the individual doctrines of faith. He wrote, among other things, a very solid hand dictionary of the Greek New Testament, of which a second edition was recently published, and a Homer school dictionary, the seventh edition of which was published by the Hahnsche Verlagsbuchhandlung in Hanover, and also a series of instructive and edifying writings in the spirit of the old Lutheran confession, which were published by Johannes Herrmann in Zwickau (Saxony). The third edition was published: 'Die Mbel Gottes Wort und des Glaubens einzige Quelle', in second edition 'Der Menschheit Zukunft', 'Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Bibel', 'Glück und Christentum', 'Der Weg zur Seligkeit und die Irrwege unserer Zeit', 'Glaube, Hoffnung Liebe', 'Kirchenpolitik, Sozialismus, Staatspolitik im Lichte der Bibel'." Ebeling was one of the few theologians in Germany who still firmly advocated the literal inspiration and complete inerrancy of Holy Scripture. F. B.

The Deaconess Institution in Neuendettelsau is now seventy years old. Its previous directors were Löhe, Meyer, Bezzel and Eichhorn. The present rector of the institution, Die. Lauerer, has published an account of its total value under the title "Die Diakonissenanstalt Neuendettelsau. From History and Present." According to this, the work now comprises 98 places of activity, some of which, such as Nuremberg, alone show 27 work stations in hospitals, girls' schools, community care, children's schools, etc. In the future, too, this great, beneficial work should continue to go on and on in its circles. F. B.

Dr. Leifegang-Leipzig said of faith at the conference of the "Federation for a Living People's Church" in Dresden: "In the present time of new cultural and life value systems and their problems, it is not the content of faith in its formulation that is decisive, but faith in itself as an attitude to life that is open to the present". A faith in itself without a definite content is a contradiction in terms. The Christian faith is all-

However, not openness to the present, to the world, or to God and the world, but God-centered openness and receptivity to the word of the cross, to the truth of the atonement in Christ, and to all the teachings revealed in Scripture. F. B.

"Thuringian Unity Church." Under this heading the "Reichsbote" announces the following: "As of March 31, the individual church governments of the former Protestant regional churches of the Thuringian constituent states, which were united on December 5, 1919, to form a unified Thuringian Protestant Church, have ceased to exist. All the activities of the individual church governments which have not yet been taken over have passed from this day to the Regional Church Council in Eisenach." This news, which, by the way, according to our observation, has been passed over with silence in the ecclesiastical press, confirms the judgment which we formerly took in the Thuringian church question. The Thuringian Unity Church, for which, according to the directions prevailing in it, the designation Uniate or even Protestant seems too good, has put an end to the Lutheran churches as they existed before in individual states of Thuringia (Saxe-Altenburg, Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, Reuß j. L.). At that time the individual church governments were still partly in existence; now they have also ceased. It is true that one has tried to secure the Lutheran character of the individual parts of the country with respect to the agendas and the like; but the Regional Church Council in Eisenach, which is not Lutheran, stands above the entire Regional Church. Will it have the possibility and the will to maintain and protect the Lutheran confession? The history of the Union shows otherwise, and it will be no different in Thuringia. When will it be learned in Lutheran circles that the Lutheran Church demands a Lutheran church regiment as a service which only such men can render who themselves stand on the Lutheran confession and are committed to the same? Without Lutheran church government the Lutheran church withers and perishes; at best it leads a puny sham existence in private associations and conferences. - Related to this is another communication. At a meeting on April 3 and 4, the German Protestant Church Committee unanimously answered in the negative the question raised in Thuringia as to whether the withdrawal of a congregation from the national church could be initiated on the basis of a state law to be enacted. As is well known, when the Thuringian churches merged, individual congregations (some of which were later only fractions) decided that they would not join this new non-denominational church. The regional church authorities declared this impossible. Individual members could leave a church, but not congregations. (But it was not a question of leaving.) Since this was also a legal claim to church, parsonage, etc., as far as we know, legal action was taken, about the outcome of which we are not informed. (If the German Protestant Church Committee denies the question of the withdrawal of a congregation, it seems to us that it has judged the matter only from the formal legal point of view in the old sense of the regional church; the question of confession remains unnoticed. How can a Lutheran congregation be compelled to remain with a church which no longer has its confession? The legal organization comes

but only secondarily. That decision of the church committee is an effect of those false unionist principles of the regional churches which do not allow the church to be a confessional community, but degrade it to an administrative unit, a special-purpose association. The Lutheran regional churches are also represented on the Church Committee. It is to be deplored that their representatives also allow themselves to be determined by such unionist principles. - Concerning these remarks of Superintendent Anthes in the "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt" of May 24, 1924 (p. 123), the "Free Church" declares that they "present and judge the factual situation essentially correctly." F. B.

"The Saxon Teachers' Association had been led for a long time by people who worked against the denominational school and a biblical and religious education. But since the revolution the leadership of the association has come to persons who saw their ideal politically in social democracy and pacifism, but religiously in atheism. 'The Christian-minded minority,' complains a teacher in the 'Dresd. Nachr.', 'was coldly and mockingly pushed aside. . . . Dissenters were forbidden any expression of their views in speech or writing as 'non-unionistic'. This increasingly unbearable compulsion of conscience has now led to the foundation of a new Saxon Teachers' Association, whose programme with regard to religion is expressed in the words: 'We demand the German-Christian school with religious instruction taught in a childlike manner, in a Protestant spirit, which is subject only to the supervision of the State.' " The "Free Church" judges that the teachers of this new association "most probably want to give religious instruction according to the well-known Zwickau Theses, behind which, after all, the whole Teachers' Association stood in 1908 (with the exclusion of the catechism)." F. B.

"We throw off the mask." The "Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt," the organ of the Lutheran Federation, comments on this statement by Söderblom, which has already been reported in "Lehre und Wehre": "If this news is true, and we have no reason to doubt it, then conditions are now emerging in the Swedish national church that we have long had in the German national churches. Some things may have existed for a long time for those who know, but obviously this is a deliberate advance, and at the head of it is Sweden's archbishop! That he was "liberal" was known, and much of what he said and did caused head-shaking (e.g. the conclusion of communion with the Anglican Church); now he himself says: "We are throwing off the mask. Whether the Lutheran Church of Sweden will have the strength to assert the validity of the Confession even against its own Archbishop, we do not know. But a stand will also have to be taken outside Sweden; D. Söderblom was a representative of Sweden at the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach and was elected to the Executive Board there. In the future the World Convention will have to reject such a representative who does not stand on the Lutheran Confession, even if he is an archbishop." But how could it be allowed to happen without protest that Söderblom at Eisenach was recognized as a member and elected to the executive committee, since it was known "that he was liberally directed"? F. B.

The educational work of the Brüdergemeinde has now existed for two hundred years. In the "A. E. L. K." it says: "On May 12, 1724, in the small town of Herrnhut, which at that time had only a few houses, the foundation stone was laid for the

first 'Gemeinhaus' was laid, in which a country school for young noblemen was established. Admittedly, it only existed for a short time, but this first seed bore rich fruit. The one country school has developed into a worldwide educational work for boys and girls of all classes, which is carried on by the Brethren Church throughout Germany and beyond its borders. In four boys' educational homes, an upper lyceum, 20 higher girls' schools and daughters' homes, and several private elementary and secondary schools, the Brethren Church may today do its work for German youth. About 4000 pupils, more than ever in earlier years, are now in the care of the Brüdergemeinde, which itself has only about 9000 members. . . . Memorial Day was festively celebrated in Herrnhut by a large youth festival of 1200 boys and girls from all parts of Germany." The Herrnhuters are praised for "imbuing their schools with a warm Christian spirit of life." F. B.

The German Girls' Bible Circles. This association held its federal conference in June at Höxter in Westphalia, to which 1400 (three years ago there were only 500) young girls had gathered, from Germany, Switzerland, Austria, etc. "What was striking about them," says the "A. E. L. K.," "was the restraint of their nature, which, with all the freshness of youth, as is peculiar to young girls, avoided the noisy and loud, the quietness at the meeting in the morning, the silence at the parting of the evening. . . 'Tell me, what do these young girls want?' asked a resident of Höxter. 'What do they want?' was the answer. 'The Bible they want, and the Lord Christ they want; they are the girls' Bible circles from all over Germany, who gather every week around the Bible, look at it together, pray together, who see in the Lord Christ their Lord and King, want to serve Him in their lives.' 'What purpose has it?" was the new question. 'What purpose has it if this piece of German youth turns to God, if we get again pious housewives and mothers, if from the youth our nation is renewed? Can our people be helped in any other way out of its brokenness, out of its swamp, than by a return to God? And here is the beginning of a return to God. That is why they have the burning lamp for a sign; it is the lamp of the light of God, the light of eternity; that must shine again in our dark time, or our time is lost. Christ we must have again; all else is of no avail.' 'Yes, if you think so, you are right. May one listen at the meetings?'" It seems to us that this movement is a far more conservative one than the "religious awakening" among young men, of which we also often read in German papers. Its direction, however, is evidently more a Uniate or Reformed than a Lutheran one. F. B.

The community of proletarian freethinkers has been granted the rights of a public corporation by the Thuringian government. The "Atheist", 1924, No. 3, explains which rights are connected with this. Whoever wishes to resign from this community must henceforth, just as in the case of leaving a church, effect his resignation at the state office - in Thuringia at the registrar's office. The registrar has to send a copy of the resignation to the board of the local group of freethinkers. For underage children (up to

The father must make the declaration before the age of fourteen. Conversely, however, membership in the proletarian community is inherited from the father to the children without further ado, unless the children later declare their explicit withdrawal before the official body. Furthermore, the community has the right to demand that freethought teachers be employed in proportion to the number of its school-age members.

The Work of the German Mission. According to the "Yearbook" 1924 of the united German Missionary Conferences, 36 fields of work with 352 mission stations, 513 European missionaries (including the female professional staff) and about 583,000 Gentile Christians are still under the direct administration of German missionary societies. Non-German missionary societies care for and administer 34 fields of work which were formerly under German administration, with 306 mission stations and 231,000 Christians.

Concerning the German missionaries in India, Sir Arthur Yapp, the General Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Movement of England, writes in his Association Journal: "When I was in India, I had many opportunities to inquire about the various rumors that circulated during the war about the German missionaries. In Madras, Bangalore and on the Malabar coast, everywhere I was told the same thing. The German missionaries have evidently done great things in the organization and general establishment of their work. The sympathies of the German missionaries were naturally on the side of their own country during the great struggle, but in spite of all my inquiries I have not been able to ascertain unequivocally any outward act of revolt against the British Government, and so far as I have been able to ascertain the German missionaries as such have made no attempt to excite discontent among the Indian members of their Church. Missionaries, merchants, public servants, Indian Christians, all concurred in this." But what does Yapp now propose for redressing the wrongs done to the German missionaries by the English through calumny and brutal expulsion? F. B.

Impoverishment of Germany. According to the "Beamtenbund," Germany has to support, in addition to the unemployed and short-time workers: 785,000 war-disabled (originally 1,275,000), 533,000 war widows with 1,134,000 children entitled to support, 58,000 orphans, 200,000 needy parents of fallen soldiers, 1,400,000 recipients of invalidity and old-age pensions, 523,000 recipients of orphans' pensions, 1,000,000 small pensioners with dependents. The picture of impoverishment showed, among other things, the following further features in 1923: decrease in the consumption of meat 40 per cent, of butter 39 per cent; increase in the consumption of dog meat 415 per cent. Seven million Germans lack a bed of their own. - At the same time, the negotiations on the Dawes Plan again show that everything is still only thinking of how to begin to plunder Germany further. F. B.

In May a joint conference of Protestant and Catholic clergymen took place **against alcoholism.** The overall theme was: "The Recovery of Our People's Life. From the board of the Federation of Abstinent Pastors, university professor D. Hans Schmidt-Gießen spoke about the "Alcohol Problem in the Old Testament". The second lecture by Father Edwin-

Halberstadt dealt with the subject: "Alcohol consumption in the light of the New Testament." Furthermore, a preacher of the Methodist Church, Professor D. Niebergall-Marburg, Dr. Joh. Ude-Graz, H. Strahler-Burghof and finally University Professor D. Mahling-Berlin had their say. The latter stated, among other things: Our goal was: demand a complete ban on alcohol, get rid of alcohol! It was proposed and decided to send a resolution to the Reichstag that the ever-increasing alcoholic evil be controlled, and that a petition be sent to the consistories of the Protestant Church and the bishoprics of the Catholic Church, in which the duty of abstinence is urged upon pastors and priests.

Romish abuse of religion for political purposes. Arthur Dinter, the well-known author of the anti-Semitic novel "Die Sünde Wider das Blut" ("The Sin Against the Blood"), is now leader of the völkisch-social bloc in the Thuringian parliament. In a speech there he said: "I am a Catholic myself and have belonged to the Catholic Church from the cradle to the present day. We ethnic Germans do not fight the Catholic religion, but we do fight those ultramontane, internationally oriented Jesuit powers which misuse the faith of Catholics for political purposes. We are mortal enemies of a system that mixes politics and religion. That is why we are mortal enemies of the Centre Party." In America, too, it is this striving of the Romanists for political power, and the abuse of Catholic "faith" for this purpose, that does not quiet the mind. F. B.

"Mary as Coredemptrix." At the consecration of Linz Cathedral, the Bishop of Meitzen, Dr. Schreiber, said, "I live among people of other faiths. How many beautiful cathedrals and hundreds of churches, and how desolate and empty - no JEsus in them and no Mary!" He celebrated Mary as Coredemptrix. She had a decisive part in the redemptive activity of Jesus; he sat on her lap when the shepherds worshipped him, he sat on her treasure when the three kings paid homage to him, and finally she stood under his cross when he died for the salvation of the world. In the festschrift, the Bishop of Linz coined the word "Marianism" for this kind of Christianity: "Let Upper Austria remain Marian for and for!"

"Retreats for Dissenters." Under this heading the Catholic "Germania" of May 14, 1924, announces: "In Holland for some years retreats have been held for dissenters. Father van Ginneken 8. 4. the meritorious leader of the Dutch conversion movement, writes in the 'Stimmen der Zeit' (Heft 1 u. 2 1923/24): 'The agenda was almost the same as in our retreat. We followed exactly the retreat booklet of Saint Ignatius. The tone was one of contemplation, not apostolic proof. It is not so much the purpose of such retreats to convince dissenters of the truth of Catholic dogmatics as to give them an opportunity to be introduced, on a trial basis, wholly and completely to the Catholic life of the soul. Such retreats take place in Biesdorf near Berlin, for gentlemen in Hoheneichen; for ladies in Dresden; for ladies in Neviges; for gentlemen in Neviges (Rhld.).'"

The Aryan, Germanic or German Religion. From the article "Christ the Aryan" in No. 9 of the paper "Raffe und Religion," the Free Church of June 29 also quotes, among other things, the following passages: "Two dreadful mis-

For almost two thousand years, the two falsehoods have denied the way to peace and truth to men who cannot come to their own knowledge: the lie that the God of the Jews is the God of Christ, and the lie that Christ is a Jew." "Lowly parochialism defends the Jewish Christ to this day. . . . The Old Testament is a counterfeit, inasmuch as it is not a revelation of God to a holy people, but a many-piece collection of good and bad, old and new, false and genuine traditions and news." . . . . The Gospels are also counterfeit, and it is not truthfulness to claim that they contain the pure teaching of the Saviour JEsus Christ. . . . Paul the Jew has fully Judaized the pure message of Christ the Aryan, and has thus set the church, which relies entirely on his interpretation and activity, on the slippery slope on which it is sliding irrecoverably downward." "Man recognizes God to the extent that he himself is full of divine nature: the shaman the fetish, the Jew his god of race and vengeance, who cheats, murders, steals [!!] with him. The Aryan recognizes God as the meaning of the world [?]; to him he is necessity, highest aspiration, benevolent father of all spirits and men, fulfiller of destiny, embracing the high and the low, including the world in himself, working from himself back into the world. Because the Aryan recognizes God in himself to the extent that he himself is of divine design, no limits of faith are drawn for him. He knows [how?] with unshakable certainty of his sonship with God, and smiles at the "thought" which only religious insanity can enter into, that his greatest brother in God, Christ, was born among men as a Jew." Sapieuti "at!

The authenticity of the mission command of Jesus", Matth. 28, 18 ff., is also denied by Harnack in the just published new edition of his great work "Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten". Jesus himself had never done missionary work with the Gentiles, had never commanded it, but had rather expressly instructed the apostles "not to go on the way of the Gentiles". The mission command had been "constructed from the historical developments of the time that followed and had been properly put into the mouth of the Risen One". Nevertheless, Harnack must admit: "The formulation of the Manifesto, Matth. 28, 18 ff. - for so it may well be called - is a masterpiece, as soon as one looks only at its content and removes all historical scruples from one's mind. He who conceived the sentences (surely the author of the first Gospel himself) already had an impression of the person of JEsu and the greatness and future of his work, which cannot be surpassed: 1. JEsus possesses all authority in heaven and on earth. 2. JEsus is always present with His own until the end of the world. 3. JEsus, as Son, forms one 'name' with the Father and the Holy Spirit. 4. JEsus commanded that all nations should become his disciples, and sent forth his disciples for this purpose before he left the earth. (5) Jesus commanded the means of mission to be baptism, which leads into communion with that triune name, and the observance of all his commandments, in which the world of nations is to be instructed. Greater and more cannot be said in forty words." On this arbitrariness of Harnack's, the "A. E. L. K." remarks: "Does not this unsurpassable greatness then point back to the Master Himself, of whom alone it would be worthy? No man conceives in this way. And absolute certainty even Harnack will not ascribe to his proofs to the contrary."

F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. September 1924. No. 9.

Several testimonies for the resurrection of the flesh from the Old Testament.

The resurrection of the flesh is a pure article of faith, that is, as the dogmatists say, this truth of salvation belongs to the articulis puris fidei, qui unice ex revelatione divina cognoscuntur, in contrast to the articulis mixtis, qui non solum ex revelatione, verum etiam ex lumine naturae constant. [1]) But this is not to say that the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh is nonsensical without Scripture, for Paul replies to Festus, "I do not race, but I speak true and reasonable words," Apost. 26, 25.

So the doctrine of life after death is not contrary to reason, for there is no heathen people, no matter how low they have sunk, who do not think of life after death and at least confess the immortality of the soul. The greatest thinkers of all nations and times have in their philosophical system a kind of locus de novissimis. There are only three exceptions: first, the Epicureans of old and new times, who want their heaven on earth ("Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we shall be dead," 1 Cor. 15:32; Isa. 22:13; 56:12); secondly, the poor, afflicted pessimists, who long for endless rest in nothingness, want to know nothing of another life, and think they have already lived too much ("Man's greatest fault is that he was born"); thirdly, incomprehensible modern theologians, who also still speak of a kind of immortality of the spirit, but condemn the "egoistic belief in immortality" (Schleiermacher). The Spiritist of today, who wants to call back the spirits of the deceased and confer with them, is actually still on a higher level.

Who over reason is the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh. You may peruse and study the textbooks of the philosophy and religion of the world, but where you find there such a thing as resurrection of the flesh, for instance, in the Zendavesta and in the

1) Schmid, Dogmatik, p. 59.

Koran, in Socrates or Plato, the teaching is either taken from the Scriptures, or it is not there at all. Therefore: Scripture witness nifse.

We ask for testimonies for the resurrection of the flesh, first of all from the Old Testament in this article. We do not demand that these words should always be there: "resurrection of the flesh", but the thing must be there, and so clearly that we can recognize and believe it.

The resurrection of the flesh, not the immortality of the soul, is spoken of here. Scripture knows nothing of a mere Platonic survival of the soul after death; it never speaks of the immortality of the soul alone, but always of immortality as encompassing both body and soul, Isa. 26, 19; Matth. 10, 28. It is true that the expression "of the flesh" is not very melodious in German, as Luther already says in the Large Catechism: "In proper German, however, we would speak thus: Resurrection of the body or corpse; but there is no great power in this, if one only understands the words rightly." 2) We understand what is meant by this: corporis resurrectio, resurrection of the body.

And the important thing is whether the whole Scripture teaches a resurrection or not. For it is not merely for this reason that we are concerned to investigate an abstract truth from the testimonies, but the truth concerns us personally very closely. We are sinners and must go to death. Will we come out of death? I do not mean a general belief in the immortality of the soul, such as all the heathen teach, such an indefinite, vague continuance of life, whether it be a "pious renunciation of one's own personality and sinking into God," or an invented going up into a higher being, but it is a question of this: will we, will I, body and soul, come out of death again?

We say in faith: Yes. For the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh is one of the fundamental articles of Christian doctrine, without the acceptance of which the Christian faith cannot stand. Scripture says that Hymenaeus and Philetus were short of the truth in saying that the resurrection had already happened; they had been shipwrecked in their faith, 2 Tim. 2:17, 18; 1 Tim. 1:19. So all must believe or have believed the doctrine of the resurrection, even in the Old Testament, or they could not be saved. For to be saved it is necessary that I know my sins; but this implies that I know that God punishes them, punishes me if I do not get rid of them, even after death, yes, even more so after death, "that every man may receive according to that he hath done in the bodily life, whether it be good or bad," 2 Cor. 5:10 (personal responsibility). He who denies it, he-

2) Müller, Die symb. Books, p. 459.

knows no sin, no need of repentance and a Savior, and cannot be saved. Ergo: fundamental doctrine.

And finally, the doctrine of the resurrection did not "develop gradually", as the newer theologians claim, but is there from the beginning, even in the Old Testament. Admittedly, we do not find the doctrine equally clearly expressed everywhere, but it is there. It is just as with the prophecies of Christ. The doctrine of the Messiah did not develop gradually, but was there from the beginning. It is the same with the doctrine of the resurrection. And there is but one difference. As far as the incarnation and the work of redemption are concerned, the Messianic prophecies have already been fulfilled, but the resurrection is still to come.

The first witness who appears for the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh is Moses. For if this is true, as we have already seen (2 Tim. 2; 1 Tim. 1), that the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh belongs to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, then Adam and Eve must also have believed this doctrine already. And they did. The only question is: Did Moses write about it? Most assuredly, right on the first leaves of Scripture. There we have only to put three statements together, and when they are properly put together, there comes out a most glorious testimony of Scripture to the resurrection of the flesh. These sayings are:

1. Gen. 3, 19; 3, 15; 4, 1 - Adam and Eve had fallen into sin. The punishment should be: "to die of death", "to become earth". Here is the word XXXX, earth, terra, from which Adam had been taken, and of which his very name, Adam, reminded him. "For thou art earth, and shalt become earth." Here the word XXX, dust, dust, pulvis (powder), is opposed to XXXX. So when Adam is not clearly shown the punishment, it is explained to him. He is to rot, become dust and ashes. What does that mean? Death, bodily death, that was the punishment. But Adam and Eve were to be redeemed. From what? From punishment. They were to be redeemed by the seed of the woman, and the promise of redemption even preceded the description of the punishment. How far this saying, Gen. 3:15, is a prophecy of Christ, is out of the scope of this treatise, but it is a prophecy of the Redeemer with a promise of redemption. Of what? Of the punishment. And the punishment? Death, the becoming-earth. Is that not a prophecy of resurrection? Yes, someone might object, but it's far-fetched. Wait a minute! Let's say I'm sentenced to life in prison right now. That's the sentence. Then suddenly someone comes along and says the sentence should be taken away. What do I think about? Am I thinking primarily of how I am to be acquitted and pardoned, how the judge is to read out a writing on which my pardon is written?

No, I'm thinking about how I'm going to get out of prison or not have to go in at all. Because that was the punishment. Now let's put ourselves in the position of Adam and Eve. They had fallen into sin and were to be punished. But the Seed of the woman was to redeem them. Then they thought not only of the image of God, the righteousness and holiness which they had lost, not only of the sin into which they had fallen, but precisely also of death, of becoming again, from which state they were to be delivered. With such plain words, what could they have believed otherwise? It is arbitrary to suppose that they were too obtuse to realize this. Before them stood the Creator, and under their feet was the earth from which God had made them. Of course, for the time being they had to become this earth again; they had to die of death. And if they did not come to earth for a thousand years, they would die on that day, but they had the hope, the promise, the promise that they could take comfort in the Saviour of the resurrection. And did they believe this? Yea, they believed it so much that they thought even the wicked Cain was the Redeemer. Eve said, "I have the man, the Lord."

Summa: Here, out of the dark night of the Fall, bright rockets for the resurrection shoot up to heaven. From the opposition of becoming-earth, the resurrection of the flesh is taught. Yes, resurrection of the flesh. And not in some third or fourth line, "gradual and developing," dark and hidden, but actual and proper. Peter says, "We believe . . . Likewise also they," Acts. 15:11. Paul says, "I do not run." "I say nothing but that which the prophets said should come to pass, and Moses," Apost. 26, 25. 22. Luther says, "And is included in this short saying [Gen. 3, 15] all that the gospel and our faith hold, as that [there] should be a resurrection and another life after death." 3)

2. 1 Mos. 5, 24 - Schleiermacher says about this saying with reference to Weish. 4, 7-11, that Enoch died at an age of 365 years, which was very young for that time! It is strange how these learned doctores theologiae, just like the scribes at the time of Christ, do not know the Scriptures, Matth. 22, 29. For if we cannot prove from this saying of Enoch's ascension his bodily redemption from death, what then do we do with Hebr. 11, 5? The "And was seen no more," et non apparuit, really means, He was no more, disappeared without a trace. Compare Gen. 42:13, where the same word is found in the original text, "But the one is no more," "and one is not."

The matter is simply this: With Gen. 3, 15 Adam consoled himself

3) Walch III, 119.

and his children against sin and death. Then, anno mundi 927, while father Adam was still alive, three years before his death, something wonderful happened. Enoch the pious was taken away by God without seeing death. Truly, a glorious sermon of God in deed to confirm His promise! One would say that God did this on purpose to give special comfort to the old Adam who was gradually turning to earth. Him God did not take; nay, Adam was to die and become earth indeed. Who in another was he to strengthen his faith. And what did the faithful think of this? The heavens are opened, the merciful hands of God reach down and save a child of death. Yes, we shall live, said old Adam. We shall live, said his children. Enos' sermon is true! Luther says of this saying, "Therefore the summa is, that with history he hath signified the resurrection from the dead, and hath separated this mortal life from that which is immortal, to give us consolation, that we which are of flesh and blood may come to live for ever." 4)

3. Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 26:4; 28:14 - Luther says of these sayings: "This is the whole theology in one heap. Thus God has summarized the whole gospel and kingdom of Christ in these short words, so that no one can emphasize it enough. Abraham understood it well, and so did the prophets. If we had no more, we would still have Scripture enough on it. I also think that the holy fathers had all the books on this saying. What the Scriptures will contain, they contain all in one heap, that one may not make many extracts, but more extracts." 5) "To be blessed," benedictus, is understood from the opposite, "to be cursed," maledictus. But when God blesses or curses, bene- or maledicit, he does not merely speak words, but as Luther says, "When he opens his mouth and lets a word go, it is valid." And what does bless mean? To bless does not mean merely to cancel what God, in stating the penalty, has stated to be the consequences of sin: "Cursed is the field," "bearing children with pain," "sweat of thy face," sorrow, weakness, a sick or naked body, etc., and then sin and death shall remain? No; "blessing" rather goes far higher. The outward consequences of sin remain, and these we must bear patiently as well as bodily death, but the sting is gone, and the victory is given us. And if we keep in mind that the curse and the very penalty for sin was death, blessing is redemption from the whole dominion of sin, life and resurrection. And between these prophecies and the prophecy of the woman's seed in Paradise there is only this difference: the promised woman's seed, her seed, was now to be "thy seed." And what

4) Walch III, 193. 5) Walch III, 526.

of that prophecy is true of these. And lastly, the redemption from the penalty of sin, from bodily and eternal death, was to be for all, not merely for Abraham's family, XXXXX, gens, but for all families, families, of the earth; not merely for one people, the Jews, but also for the Gentiles, for all the nations of the earth. But if the curse remain, it remaineth for all.

4. Gen. 15:15; 25:8, - These sayings are literally, "But thou shalt depart [go - it might also be translated, thou shalt come] to thy fathers with peace. Thou shalt be buried in old age, in good." "And it came to pass, that Abraham died in a good old age, old and full, and was gathered unto his people." Somebody might say, "But there's nothing in here about being resurrected. Wait a minute! "With peace" shall he depart. His death shall not be something to be terrified of, but to be comforted with. And where shall he go? To the fathers. Remember Enoch: "be gathered unto the fathers." That means to die? Oh, no. The gathering of the faithful to their people has a peculiar meaning in Scripture. Abraham was gathered, likewise Ishmael, chap. 25, 17. From this Luther concludes that Ishmael returned to the confession of his father, and remained therein. Isaac was gathered, chap. 35, 29; likewise Jacob, chap. 49, 29. 33; likewise Aaron, Deut. 32, 50; yea, even Moses, of whom we know that he and Elias already have a transfigured body, was gathered to his fathers, Deut. 32, 50; Matt. 17, 3. Thus "was gathered" does not mean that his name was entered on the necrology of the dead fathers, but is rather meant an entrance into the living congregation of the saints. Congregatus est ad populum suum. And when it is said, He declined, he died, he was gathered to his people, and then (Gen. 25:9): "His sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him," then in the patriarch the belief in a resurrection is just as well known and attested as when we say in our own graveyard, "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ."

5. Gen. 22, 5 - In connection with Hebr. 11, 17-19: "And he thought, God is able to raise from the dead" this story of the sacrifice of Isaac can be cited as a glorious testimony of Abraham's faith for the resurrection of the flesh. Abraham was to have a son in his old age. This he believed. And the promise was fulfilled. Further, this son was to be the bearer of the promise, and through him Abram was to become a Wraham. Abraham believed that also. This son he was to slaughter! What now? Should he refuse to do so? Is God a liar? No. What then? This (Luther): "God will raise him up again. Abraham believed and knew no other, for the son mooed

die. Again, that he should become a father of many nations, Rom . 4, 17. How do these two rhyme together? Mso, as St. Paul interprets Hebr. 11, 17. 19." 6) "And thought God was able to raise the dead." "And when we have worshipped, we will come again to you."

6. Gen. 49:18, and the beautiful conclusion, vv. 29-33. - Old Jacob in Egypt, dying, blesses his children, vv. 1-28. All at once he interrupts his blessing, v. 18: "Lord, I wait for thy salvation!" How beautiful! Truly he has nothing more to expect in this life. His old, dull body must go to the tomb. And yet he is not indifferent where his dead body is laid. The hope of the promise and the faith in the resurrection is a kind of confession to him (just as we do not want to have our bodies burned). His body is to be buried in the "churchyard" that his grandfather purchased for this purpose from the children of Heth. There beside the bodies of Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebekah, Leah, his body also was to rest for the time being - not always; with death all is not over. We see this again in the expressions "buried" and "gathered together". Here it says explicitly "and was gathered together" in contrast to "and he passed away." This does not mean that Jacob was merely transferred to the realm of the dead; for otherwise God could not afterwards have said, "I am the God of Abraham," etc. But we come to this passage now.

7. Ex. 3:6. - Literally, "I, the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." So he does not say, Formerly, when Abraham was alive, I was his God, but he indicates a relation which still exists now. If we slip in an am and put a proper emphasis on it, then we have translated quite correctly: I am. Vulgate: ego sum. Septuagint: *"Εγώ είμι.* Yes,
Christ Himself translates, *Έγώ είμι ό ϑεός Αβραάμ κτλ.*, Matth. 22, 32.
So when the Lord says here: I, God, the God, their God, their God, what does that mean? It means, I am a gracious God, who no longer curses, but blesses; who does not kill, but makes alive. But the interpretation and interpretation of this passage is easy. For the eternal Son of God Himself has used it as a proof of the resurrection, Mark. 12:26, 27; Matt. 22:32; and of course the newer ones, who shrink from nothing, accuse Christ of false exegesis; but they know not the Scriptures. And with Christ we may assert, in the many passages in the Old Testament where it is said, "I am thy God," that there the resurrection is taught. (Pieper, Dogmatics III, 601.)

8. 6 Mos. 32, 39. - Context: Moses celebrates his last, his hundred and twentieth birthday, by resigning his office,

6) Walch III, 515.

Joshua decreed in his place, completed the book of the law, and wrote a song at God's command. This song is then to be inscribed in the Book of the Law as a reminder to future generations of what God has done, what God does, can do, and will do. V. 39 is in this song. In the original text, not merely is the ability attributed to God that He can kill and make alive, but He is said to actually do it. This song is an Old Testament dogma and creed. Here we have, as it were, the "three articles" of the Old Testament. He who believes that God has power to kill and to make alive, to create and to raise up, has the first article. He who believes that God also does it in the woman's seed, turning death into life, curse into blessing, has the second article. He who believes it at all has the Spirit of God and the third article. And that the people of God have learned this song of faith from Moses is shown by Hannah after centuries: 1 Sam. 2, 6.

9. Deut. 34, 5-7 - Moses died and the Lord buried him. The devil fought with the angel Michael (Jude 9) over Moses' body, so that he would become a prey of decay; but the Lord took him out of the grave again and transferred him to heaven and transfigured him, and so he did not see the decay. So Moses and Elijah appeared with transfigured bodies next to Jesus on the mount of transfiguration, Matth. 17, 3. 4. Should the resurrection of the flesh be so difficult to believe, when at this moment resurrected and transfigured bodies have been in heaven for thousands of years? (Cf. Stöckhardt, Biblical History, Old Testament, p. 155).

10. Job 19:25-27. - Now we come to a chief Old Testament proof-place for the doctrine of the resurrection, a classic and beautiful, though difficult and much disputed passage. (For a full treatise on this passage, see "Doctrine and Defense," 1915, January and February.) As for difficulty in translating this passage, Luther already complains about it in the well-known "Epistle of Interpretation." But Father Luther could have saved himself the trouble; for, in the first place, he translated wrongly, and, in the second place, Job is good for nothing - so say Schleiermacher, Gerlach, and others. But with these gentlemen, who deny Father Luther, but are not afraid to bear his name, and their theology, begotten of the sinful seed of higher criticism, and conceived in unbelief, we need not, thank God, dwell long.

As for Job, he is not a fictitious person, Ezek. 14, 14; Jas. 5, 11. If he was the king of Edom, Gen. 36, 33 (Jobab), a descendant of Esau, as some suppose, then he lived in the age of the patriarchs. This also fluffs quite well; for after

After his suffering he lived another 140 years, so that he saw children and children's children to the fourth generation. The author of the book is unknown to us; perhaps Moses wrote it.

Against the "gradually developing theologians" who think that Job could not have had such a clear light concerning the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, a few more words. Job not only knew of the resurrection of the flesh, but he knew much more. He knew of the last day, chap. 21:30; 14:12 ff. He knew of several persons in God, ch. 16, 19 ff. Literally, "Well, well! Behold in heaven my witness! And he that witnesseth for me on high." (Parallelism membrorum.) V. 20 in the original text, "My advocate is my kinsman; but mine eye doth water unto God." V. 21 (literally): "And he shall intercede for the man with God [plead his cause as an advocate], and the Son of man for his friend." "Son of man" and "advocate," are not these quite familiar expressions in the New Testament? Job 10:21: "Before I go, and come not again, even into the land of darkness and gloom." V. 22: "Into the land where it is pitch dark, and where there is no order, where it shines like darkness?" Apparent contradiction; but this is temptation, anxious hour. Surely Job's dogmatic conviction cannot be constructed from this.

Now chapter 19. Job defends himself against the blunt accusation of Bildad, ch. 18. Bildad uses the third person in his speech, but means Job. In ch. 19 Job defends himself. In the 6th verse he even accuses God in his challenge. He pleads for mercy, v. 21. But if, notwithstanding his plea, ch. 16, 18, "Earth, cover not my blood!" his innocence will no longer be revealed on this earth-and here he comes triumphantly out of his contestation-he knows, he takes comfort in this, that he has a Redeemer in heaven. And what he thinks of this Redeemer he would like to have written down with an iron pen on lead for eternal remembrance.

V. 25-27 (literally): "And [but] I," emphatic. "Know," am certain. Firm knowledge, especially in religious, spiritual sphere, Ps. 79:6; 2 Tim. 1:12. "My redeemer," heir, Ruth 4:4, 6; Deut. 25:49. Blood-friend, one who has the duty of redeeming a relative who has become a slave. Christ, the witness, advocate, intercessor, Son of Man, ch. 16:21, is meant. "Live." The heir might take off his shoe and renounce, but this one lives, John 14:19. "JEsus, he, my Saviour, liveth; I also shall behold life." "And as the last," as victorious on the field of battle (Hebrew expression). "Against the dust," on the earth, from the grave. "Shall arise," appear, rise - at the last day. "And after," and hereafter. "My skin" (or acc. instr., with my skin). "Will surround," circumdare, chap. 19:6. (Zer-

disturb, crumble, drill, etc., as some translate, does not fit). "These," fem. namely, to add: Bones, bones, skeleton. "And in my flesh," et in carne mea, out of my body, local. Schleiermacher says, XX means without. It is true. "And I shall see God without my flesh" ? But that does not fit. Job would thereby again annul and overthrow everything. But the word XX, according to the dictionary, also means from - out of. "And out of my flesh shall I behold God." This fits; for Scripture never speaks of resurrection without a body, Isa. 26, 19; Matt. 10, 28. And in the case of the soul one cannot really speak of resurrection at all, because the soul is in itself immortal. "Shall behold God," Ps. 17, 15. The rest is easy: "Whom I shall behold unto me, and mine eyes shall behold him, and not a stranger." There a personal, bodily, "selfish" resurrection is spoken and taught, such as cannot be spoken at all in clearer and more unmistakable words. (Song 111:3.) "My kidneys are consumed in my bosom." Thus Job expresses his desire. The Hebrews held the kidneys to be the seat of sensation. We sing, "My longing heart so great desire hath, and is no more with me."

Truly, a glorious testimony to the resurrection of the flesh! Let us make Job's confession our confession! (Song 111, 5. 6.)

11. Ps. 16, 9-11. - This passage is explained by the apostle Peter, Apost. 2, 25. 32 (Resurrection of Christ).

12. Ps. 17:15-"Awake" means to awaken from the sleep of death, 2 Kings 4:31; Isa. 26:19; Job 14:12; Dan. 12:2.

13. Ps. 102, 27-29. - "Abide", remain like God, when heaven and earth pass away? Does the psalmist speak without sense, or what is it?

14. 1 Kings 17:21, 22 - Elijah wakes up the son of a widow.

15. 2 Kings 2:11 - Elijah goes to heaven. See Enoch, Moses, Christ's transfiguration on the mountain.

16. 2 Kings 4:33-36 - Elisha wakes up the son of the Sunamite.

17. 2 Kings 13:21 - A dead man, cast upon Elijah's bones, comes to life.

18. Isa. 26:19; 66:14.

19. Ezek. 37, 3. 6. 7. - The resurrection of the flesh, which was known to the people before, the prophet makes the image of the return from captivity, Hos. 6, 2. The resurrection of the flesh was so well known to the Jews in captivity that the prophet uses the resurrection as an example for the future return of the Jews to the land of Canaan! The resurrection is the known, the return the unknown. And he who can see no evidence in the Old Testament of the resurrection of the flesh is as foolish as he,

who, every time I use the word "round like a sphere", for example, first wants proof that the sphere is round!

20. Dan. 12,2. - This passage is important because it clearly teaches a resurrection of the pious and the wicked. Not in the sense of the development theologians - for we have heard that Job already knew about the last day and judgment - but in so far as this is clearly expressed here. "Many" means all, Joh. 5, 28. That is how the scripture uses "many", Matth. 20, 28; Rom . 5, 19.

21. Hos. 13, 14. - This passage is interpreted by the Holy Spirit Himself in I Cor. 15 as speaking of the resurrection of the dead.

So much for Old Testament passages for the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh. And did the Old Covenant believers believe in a resurrection? See 2 Macc. 12:43-46; ch. 7.

A few more passages from the Old Testament that have been cited against the resurrection of the flesh: 1 Job 14:12, 14. These words are refuted in v. 15. Literally, "Then shalt thou call unto me, and I will answer thee" (on the last day). Or these words are impugnation. Or emphasize, "As long as the heavens remain," no man shall rise from the dead; for when the resurrection comes, the heavens will pass away. 2. Job 19:26. "Without my flesh," single of my flesh, is already refuted. 3. Isa. 26, 14. to be understood of the return to temporal life. 4. Eccl. 3, 18-20. v. 19 means death has dominion over all creatures, men and cattle. By reason no man knows of the resurrection of the flesh. (And yet Paul says, "I speak reasonable words"; see the introduction.) But God reveals to the same Ecclesiastes, ch. 12:7, "The spirit must return to God who gave it. " Adam Fahling.

On the evaluation of the Lutheran World Convention in Eisenach.

(Continued.)

After the delegates (Lutherans of all persuasions) who had met for the World Convention had communicated with one another in the brotherly manner we have described and had accepted the Confession Resolution as a common doctrinal basis, it was only logical that they should also proceed to organization. The proposals of the Organizing Committee (reported in the January issue of this journal, p. 21 f.), which were aimed in this direction, were unanimously accepted. They provide for a larger and a narrower committee. The larger committee should consist of seven to ten representatives each from Germany and the United States of America, three from Sweden, two each from Denmark, Finland and Norway, and one each from the United States.

other countries. Elected as members of the Executive Committee until the next meeting of the World Convention were: Ihmels and D. Pechmann from Germany, Jörgensen from Denmark, Lundgren from Sweden (Pehrsson took his place), Morehead and Lars Boe from America. While still in Eisenach, Morehead was elected by the Select Committee as President of the same. Thus the World Convention was organized.

And what are its purposes? The business entrusted to the Narrower Committee is stated in the organizational resolution to be: To prepare for the next World Convention; to promote harmonious cooperation in the work of love, the care of the Diaspora, and the mission to the Gentiles; to speak and act in the name of all Lutheranism where necessary; the duties mentioned by Morehead: Exchange of professors, arbitration of disputes between Lutheran groups by Lutheranism as a whole, etc. (L. u. W. 1924, 21. 82.) According to D. Melhorn, the passage in the organizational resolution concerning the duties of the Executive reads as follows: "To the Committee of Six is assigned continuation of convention business. In particular: a) It shall prepare for a future World Convention, b) It shall give consideration to, and make recommendations for, the general ministry of serving love, the duty to migrants from Lutheran groups, the emergencies of Foreign Mission operations of the Lutheran Church of the world, its objectives lying in the conserving and developing of a harmonious cooperation in relation to the above-named activities. In a similar way it shall take note of the several 'Suggestions' which were stated in the paper of Dr. J. A. Morehead, e) It shall voice the attitude of the whole Lutheran Church when it is necessary or for grave reasons desirable."

It has been claimed that there was no organization at all in Eisenach. But an assembly that unanimously adopts a doctrinal basis, elects officials and entrusts them with the aforementioned tasks, has organized itself eo ipso. Certainly the Eisenach organization is only a loose one, as any ecclesiastical and even more so a Lutheran world association can only be by its nature. But whether tightly or loosely connected, the essence of the organization is not thereby annulled. It has also been said that the World Convention kept itself within modest limits, so that an ecclesiastical connection was not formed. But the Convention consisted of representatives of the Church, and the purposes for which it created for itself an organ of action in the executive are ecclesiastical. The union that came about in Eisenach can therefore only be described as an ecclesiastical union for common ecclesiastical work.

It has also been argued that an actual organization did not take place in Eisenach for the very reason that the respective synods

were not bound by the vote of their delegates and, as far as the European representatives were concerned, it was impossible to say whom they actually represented. Both are correct, but the conclusion is wrong. It is true that only those American synods which ratify the vote of their delegates belong to the Eisenach Union, and that only as long as they freely choose to belong to it. The assessment of the European representation is also correct. For as clear and simple as this appears to be for the American synods, it is (and is likely to become the longer the more) so confused and entangled for the European national churches, where the most abnormal conditions have prevailed for decades. The state ecclesiasticism, which still exists in the Scandinavian countries, has developed in the course of time into a monstrosity, and the Volkskirche, which took its place in Germany after the war, in which likewise it is not personal Christianity, but popular and provincial burgherism, which makes the member of the church, signifies a no less great absurdum. This absurdity also appears in the question of representation in the World Convention. From whom, for example, had Bishop Ihmels his mandate? Who stood behind him? The Church of Saxony? Where and when did she give him the mandate to represent her in the World Convention? If this had been done, what members of that Church did he represent? The Positives? The liberals? The openly despisers and worldlings? All of these together? At a Lutheran World Convention! Similar questions are likely to arise among almost all the European delegates. But even if the state of affairs were much more absurd and confused, all this does not alter the fact that, as much as lay in the delegates, an ecclesiastical association, consisting of Lutherans of all tendencies, was brought into being at Eisenach, and that the delegates, by unanimously adopting the resolutions, all pledged themselves, if possible, to win over to this organization the churches to which they belong and the synods which they represent.

It has also been said that an actual organization did not take place in Eisenach, since organization was not the purpose of the World Convention at all, and if an attempt had been made, the Lutheran Federation and other Lutherans would have protested and possibly withdrawn. This is true inasmuch as the letter of invitation stated that the purpose of the World Convention was not to bring into being a new international organization, but to strengthen and extend the already existing cooperations at home and in the mission field. (L. u. W., p. 80.) Similar pronouncements were also made at Eisenach. Even Söderblom (who, of course, at the same time made it clear enough that he longed for a union not only of all Lutherans, but of all Protestants, and expected something in this direction from the World Convention) declared: "We have not come here to organize ourselves." Also the

The men of the U. L. C. were believed to be protected against the fact that they had striven for an organization in Eisenach. If this is true, then the result of the World Convention, as is usually the case, was precisely what was not intended. For it is also a fact that proposals for organization in Eisenach were considered from the very beginning and were unanimously and enthusiastically accepted at the last meeting.

But is it really because of this that no organization was planned or contemplated by the promoters of the World Convention? Of the Americans from the U. L. C. the Iowa "Church Gazette" reports that "they would have liked to see a summary of world Lutheranism." This agrees with their own pronouncements. Melhorn writes: "The American delegation thought in the direction of unifying the Church. . . . Any one who interfered with 'something practical to come from the convention' was bidding for lasting unpopularity." Knubel: "There was an intense desire to effect the establishment of Lutheranism as a world force." Miller: "American energy and initiative secured definite organization and assured the continuance of the work begun at Eisenach."(L. u. W., pp. 71. 72. 83.)

According to these statements, the representatives of the U. L. C. (the European leaders, at any rate, did not stand otherwise) had, from the very beginning, directed their attention to some union, however loose, of world Lutheranism. And in this they remained true to their tradition and their principles, principles, of course, which can only be characterized as "foreign and antagonistic to true Lutheranism", To build up a large, impressive Lutheran body, that was always the main goal of the General Synod. This was also the primary goal when the Merger was formed in 1918. In Eisenach, too, these theologians were driven not by the desire for unity in right doctrine and practice, but by the outward organization of world Lutheranism - the will to unite. And in by far the majority of the delegates assembled there they found comrades in spirit. Eisenach was fertile ground for unionist aspirations. "The Committee on Organization's Report was received with applause," reports Melhorn, and nothing else was to be expected from the very beginning.

One report read: "One also carefully avoided [in Eisenach] passing resolutions which would have to presuppose unity among the churches represented." The fact is, however, that the whole essence of Eisenach presupposed unity of faith and mutual recognition among the delegates: the fraternal intercourse, the common services and celebrations, the unanimous adoption of the confessional resolution, and especially also the enthusiastic acceptance of the confessional resolution by the delegates.

of the resolution of organization. We Missourians do not deny Lutheranism in all respects to the U. L. C. and Augustana Synod. Ecclesiastical labor fellowship, etc., however, we have heretofore disclaimed to them, and still do. Why? Because it would involve nothing less than denial of the truth with reference to all points of doctrine and practice in which the U. L. C. has not yet come to Scriptural and confessional agreement with us. Ecclesiastical fellowship with the Lutheran national churches would be tantamount to us abandoning the Scriptural and confessional doctrines of inspiration, substitutionary atonement, etc., which, as is well known, are openly and unabashedly opposed in these churches. Such fellowship with the Lutherans from the Unions, and with the Swedes who are now in church fellowship with the Anglicans, would logically bring us down to the standpoint of the Uniate, and declare the doctrines of distinction between the Lutherans and the Reformed to be trivial and not church-dividing. And now even working fellowship with Söderblom and the liberals! Lutherans who are not guided by unionist dreams and plans, but are determined to be guided solely by Scripture and confession, will never and never allow themselves to be mixed into a pie with everything that today considers itself to still belong to world Lutheranism, not even through a union such as the World Convention has brought into being. In short, if the position of the Lutheran Confession, according to which ecclesiastical fellowship, and thus also ecclesiastical working fellowship, presupposes unity in right doctrine, is correct (cf. L. and W., p. 76), then the adoption of the organizational resolution can only be condemned as unionism.

In addition to this, joint church work, carried on by Lutherans who in part represent the right doctrine and practice and in part are devoted to wrong doctrine and practice, is not only contrary to Christ and the confession, but also something contradictory and impossible in itself, as long as one or the other party does not give away its position. To co-operate means to strive together towards the same working goal. But how can this be done if one party pulls in this direction and the other in the opposite? To co-operate means to go together. But how is that possible if there is no unity with regard to the goal of the walk? "Though two walk together, may they be one among themselves?" Amos 3:3. If of two persons in St. Louis, one wants to go to New York, and the other to San Francisco, they cannot both put themselves on the same train. If they want to travel together, one must change his destination. In the same way, joint church work is only possible if all those who join together have the same doctrine and practice. Where this is not the case, they necessarily work against each other.

Principles of doctrine and practice are forces that drive in certain directions corresponding to their nature. If they are different, the directions also diverge. Different principles are different plans, according to which it is impossible to build together and harmoniously. If each sticks to his own plan, the workers cannot cooperate but only hinder each other in building. As a result of such "common" church work, a Babel of confusion then arises out of the opposing directions and endeavors, just as we have before our eyes in the European national churches and also in the American sectarian churches, in which fundamentalists and liberals now Babylonianly "work together harmoniously"! If at any point they do pull together on the same yoke, the reason is that either the false teachers or the right ones have changed their position. As a rule, it is the latter who deny their principles, which they do at the outset by allowing themselves to enter into fellowship with the false teachers.

Between Missouri, which is determined not to give up the least bit of right doctrine and practice, and the fundamentally unionist World Convention, there can therefore logically and reasonably be no ecclesiastical working community of any kind. As long as both remain what they are, any attempt to bring one into being is a contradiction in terms. According to its composition, the World Convention can only be satisfied with a unionist basis for such cooperation, while Missouri, because of its confessional position, must demand the opposite. In accordance with its nature, the World Convention, unconcerned about existing disagreements in faith, doctrine, and confession, can always place only external things at the top of the list as the actual goal of its work: fraternal intercourse, ecclesiastical fellowship, union for common work, etc., while Missouri must stick to this: First unification in doctrine and practice, which everything else follows and must always follow! If both persist in their position, there can never be even a beginning of common church work between them. To say that the union for such common work does not prevent anyone from sticking to his doctrine and practice is "bunk" and just as absurd as if we wanted to persuade someone to go with us to San Francisco because this would not prevent him from going to New York at the same time. So long, therefore, as world Lutheranism remains divided into confessional and unionistic Lutherans, so long is and remains any attempt to unite them all in any church work a contradiction in terms. The invitation to Missouri to join together in church work in the World Convention only made sense (however well intended) on the assumption that the Missourians had also become unionists.

The invitation to the World Convention named as one of its main purposes the ordering of the mission to the Gentiles, and according to the organizational decision, the executive is also to work toward harmonious cooperation of all Lutheran forces in the mission to the Gentiles.1) Of course, we Missourians are also in favor of order in the missions, not only in the heathen countries, but also at home. Now, is cooperation possible to accomplish this purpose? The first requirement we Missourians would have to make of such order is that it should in no way hinder the purpose of the church and its missionary work, which is the preaching, keeping pure, and spreading of the true gospel. We could therefore only be satisfied with an order whose foundation is right doctrine and practice. From this it follows at the same time that only with those who agree with us on this point is it possible for us to come to an understanding about the orders to be made in the missions. But since the internal nature and composition of the World Convention is quite different, and all the members of the Executive are Unionists, harmonious cooperation in this matter is ruled out from the outset. In addition, what the Unionists regard as good order, we reject as disorder contrary to Scripture and the confession (e.g., communion in prayer, worship, pulpit and Lord's Supper with false believers). And the order we declare to be the right Lutheran order, unionists tend to condemn as unloving, narrow-minded, outmoded, and

1) As in the case of ecclesiastical union in general, so also of "harmonious working together" it is often spoken of as if this were absolutely and in itself something good. But this is only the case if the work is not only done in the right way and by persons who are united in faith, but also if the goal of the work is a right one. If the work is one which God has commanded or not forbidden to the church, then, caeteris paribus, unanimous cooperation is also pleasing to God. If, on the other hand, the object of the work is a sinful one, even the most harmonious cooperation to attain it is reprehensible. In the Papists one often admires the unparalleled pulling together of all on one and the same rope. But it is all under the curse, since the purpose is the fortification and spread of antichristianity. The same is true of the cleverly directed and richly funded propaganda of the sects in the interests of their false religious, social and political aims. Harmonious cooperation with reference to a reprehensible ecclesiastical purpose is morally no higher than the cooperation of a gang of robbers. The fact that the persons involved are ecclesiastical dignitaries, priests, or Protestant preachers, does not improve the evil cause. As in every endeavor, so also in cooperation the aim must be a good one. Looked at closely, there is now in the wide world only one summum bonum, only one all-superior aim of work. This supreme good is the pure, truthful gospel of the atonement for sin through the blood of Christ, the truth which alone, but also infallibly, makes blessed. And the work which is more important, greater, and more necessary than all, is the preaching, purifying, propagating, and unwearied spreading of this gospel. According to this, there is also only one summum malum in the world. This supreme evil is the finally alone, but also infallibly damning soul-poison of false doctrine, by which the gospel is falsified, suppressed, destroyed. And the work which is more injurious than all other wickedness put together (because it robs sinners of their only salvation) is the preaching and spreading of such false doctrine. Now he who puts himself in the service of the all-salvific

impracticable. We could not name a single relationship in which, with reference to our mission in China and India, we could somehow necessarily come to an understanding with the mission societies represented in Eisenach or with the U. L. C. and the Augustana Synod. They all, though in different degrees, think and work in a unionistic way, while Missouri opposes all unionism even in the heathen mission.

This is illustrated by the present situation in India, where, as is well known, the Swedes have taken over the work of the Leipzig missionaries who were so brutally and brutally driven out by the English. As the latter have now established full church and communion fellowship with the Anglicans in their homeland, so they have also endeavored in far-off India to drive the mission entrusted to them further into an un-Lutheran, Unionist nature. The representative of Söderblom, Bishop Danell, even celebrated communion with the Anglicans in India - to the annoyance of many Indian Lutherans, some of whom separated from the Swedes and turned to Missouri for supplies. How can we now come to an understanding with the Swedes in this matter? Yes, how, as long as the Swedes remain blatant unionists and allow the annoyance to continue in India, but we refuse to abandon the Lutheran principles according to which people who stand up for the truth and who, in conscience, renounce obvious false teachers, can be granted ecclesiastical recognition and support?

The one who presents the gospel is in fellowship with all faithful Christians and is at the same time a co-worker with God, for he identifies with God's great purpose and plan. Conversely, the one who falsifies the gospel is in working relationship not only with all kinds of false teachers and deceivers, but with the devil himself, the father of lies, whose soul-murdering purpose, in so far as he promotes false doctrine, he makes his own, if not intentionally, then in fact. The church, therefore, is all about the gospel. The purification, propagation, and unceasing proclamation of it is her one great duty. And her one concern remains to avoid, eliminate, and combat everything that somehow conflicts with it. This is also the opinion when we repeatedly emphasize "pure doctrine and right practice": pure doctrine, that is, that the Gospel, which alone constitutes salvation, be proclaimed purely and loudly and not be falsified in any way, either directly or indirectly (for example, by denying a doctrine that is more distant from the core of the Gospel); right practice, that is, the actions and deeds of the Church that confirm its pure confession and do not annul it or weaken it and call it into question. If the action of a church does not agree with its words, it is not to be taken seriously. She herself cancels her oral confession by a contrary confession of deed; for deeds speak louder than words. In the struggle against unionism, too, it is ultimately always a question of the true gospel, which is no less denied and falsified by indifference to doctrine, compromise, and false practice (as unionism always entails) than by the false doctrines of those with whom one unites in unionism. Even Eisenach, where church fellowship was cultivated with theologians who in part contradict the most fundamental truths, and where everything was set on unionism and the crown was put on it by the organizational decision - for us it means nothing less than denial and falsification of the true gospel.

cannot refuse to serve? 2) Even with regard to the areas to which we would have to limit our missionary work, we would not be able to make an unconditional agreement with unionist societies and synods, since it could at any time come into conflict with God's Word and conscience.

Nor is our judgment any different with regard to the other parts in which the executive is to work for cooperation: the activity of love, the care of the Diaspora; to speak and act, if necessary, in the name of Lutheranism as a whole; to settle disputes between Lutheran groups, etc. (L. u. W., p. 82. 21.). (L. u. W., p. 82. 21.) Harmonious co-operation of world Lutheranism as a whole is in these pieces also a thing of impossibility, something contradictory in itself. It is possible only among such parts of world Lutheranism as are either united in right doctrine and practice, or are unionists. False Lutherans will judge and proceed quite differently in the things mentioned than their consciences permit confessing Lutherans to do. We Missourians, for example, could not possibly appoint an executive, chosen by a unionist world convention and composed of only unionist-minded members, to speak and act on our behalf in emergencies. How can people be trusted with right judgment and correct action who are denied right insight and decisiveness in matters of doctrine and practice! What a contradictory undertaking, moreover, if we Missourians were to entrust the Executive with the task, for example, of settling the differences between us and the U. L. C., since the same differences, only amplified, also divide us from the World Convention! Is it reasonable to try to settle disputes in such a way that one party, and the wrong one at that, is left to judge? The fact remains that two people can only unite and work together harmoniously if they are in agreement.

But, they say, you Missourians could make common cause with the World Convention and the National Lutheran Council in the work of love! However, even this cooperation is, strictly speaking..,

2) In the report on the "Annual Celebration of the Leipzig Mission" in the "A. E. L. K." of June 27 we read: "The Indian people have awakened to a strong self-confidence during the war years and are struggling for political freedom. In some circles of the Tamulen Church, moreover, there has been criticism of the Swedish Church Mission. The movement, which unfortunately found support in American missionaries of the Missouri Synod, still troubles the church leadership. But it always succeeded in restoring the unity of the church; only very small splinterings occurred." The Leipzig Mission House evidently has not the courage to state the state of affairs in India frankly, clearly, and fully. From the way the report speaks of the matter, especially from the "unfortunately," we conclude that the Mission House also approves of the un-Lutheran, unionistic nature of the Swedes. Superintendent Angerstein from Poland was also present at the "annual celebration". According to the report, he exhorted, as at the World Convention, so also here, "to faithful adherence to the Lutheran confession." This is now the timely admonition everywhere in world Lutheranism, especially for the Leipzig mission.

just as reprehensible and absurd as the others. For the relief of physical need, especially in Germany, enormous sums have been spent in our Synod, and still the money flows abundantly. We exclude no one from such physical help, not even papists, free Protestants, Jews or heathens. We would much rather help in spiritual hunger and thirst, especially in "Lutheran" Germany. In order to bring the only saving gospel to those who do not have it, or who do not have it pure and clear, the blessed message of reconciliation in Christ, together with all that Christ has commanded us to teach and do, our Christians have always been willing to offer their sacrifices.

But there is one thing we do not and must not do: we do not put our money at the service of false doctrine. We are not willing to contribute with our gifts to the falsification of the gospel or to the spreading of false doctrine, thus hindering the true work of the church, the purification and proclamation of divine truth. To starving Jews, Mohammedans, or Gentiles, we give food and drink. But we do not build their synagogues, mosques and pagodas. Similarly we hold with reference to Papists, Reformed, sects, and Unionists. Also, to help build a false, Unionist, or even liberal Lutheranism, the gifts of our Christians are not to be had for that. If it is a matter of supporting churches, we must and want to be sure that what we help to promote is not churchism contrary to Scripture and false doctrine forbidden by God, but Lutheranism faithful to the confession.

But it is a fact that the loving activity of the U. L. C. does not exclusively have the remedy of the bodily, but also of the ecclesiastical need in mind, and that it extends the latter to everything that is still somehow considered Lutheran. In the "Blättern" published by Theo. Fliedner's "Blättern aus Spanien" (No. 153) we read: "In America, our tribal friends have not forgotten us, and the National Lutheran Council with its worthy chairman, Dr. Lauritz Larsen in New York, generously granted us 17,500 pesetos in December of last year, so that we were able to pay the interest on our mortgage debt. (L. u. W. 1924, 143.) Fliedner's work in Spain, however, as has been repeatedly shown in "Lehre und Wehre," moves along thoroughly united lines. Certainly, this is a case which probably belongs to the exceptions. Mer is not the aid of the National Lutheran Council, in so far as it is support in church work, everywhere in the service of a unionism which is sometimes coarser, sometimes finer, since all churches and congregations to which such aid is given are unionist? To leave aside other considerations - what a contradiction!

Would it be, then, if the anti-Unionist Missouri wanted to unite with the Unionist National Lutheran Council in a relief work which would not exclude the support even of an apparently united church! The very first attempt at such a union would fail because of the scriptural and confessional requirement that all support in church work be regulated on the principle of pure doctrine and practice. In short, the beginning of all church union is and remains unity in the truth.

(To be continued.)

Literature.

The Praise of Him. Who Died. By *Gerhard E. Lenski.* Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. $1.25. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

In these eight sermons on the Passion, the "representative for us" comes to the fore less often than the "for us as an example". It seems misleading to us when on page 23 it is said: ". . . it will be easier for God on Judgment Day to overlook the faults and follies of the heathen, who have never heard of Christ and who consequently have never believed on Him, than it will be for Him to overlook our misdemeanors," etc. Page 25: "Thus does He [Christ at the Last Supper] in the closing hours of His life provide a ladder of escape by which any sinner who wills can climb out of the pit of sin into the light and glory of heaven." Very correct; but the "who wills" must not be interpreted synergistically. It is also correct when page 57 saws that the explanation of why a man's soul is lost lies not in predestination, but in man himself: "It lies in the will of the individual concerned." Then it goes on to say, "Do you will to be saved? Do you really want to be delivered from your sins and guilt and made one with God's children for time and for eternity? If so, then God's goodness will not let you fall from Him, no matter who you may be, and Christ will save you, no matter how black your guilt or how deep your shame." This is also true. Synergism would be if anyone were to conclude from this that such willingness is not a gift of God, but an achievement of man. Page 60: "God endures injustice at the hands of men because He is willing to wait long and patiently until men shall see their folly and shall voluntarily come to give their hearts to Him." Right! But it would be wrong to interpret "voluntarily" to mean that man himself must produce this willingness in himself. Page 65: "If we fall into sin, - and we often do, - shall we not be encouraged [by the example of Peter] to pick ourselves up again out of the dust, and to press on, inspired by what disobedient Peter was able to do? What one man has done another may be able to do," etc. Again, it would be a mistake for anyone to think that he could do such things without grace, by his own efforts. - The same publisher has sent us: *Pen Pictures of Prophets.* By Gerhard Lenski. Five short lectures on Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. HT25. F. B.

The Revelation of John. First half, chs. 1-5, with detailed introduction. Interpreted by Theodor Zahn. First to third edition. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig. 346 pages. Price: stapled, M. 12; bound M. 15.50.

T. Theodor D. Zahn, now almost eighty-six years old, is the doyen of New Testament exegetes in Germany. A "sketch of my scholarly development and my literary career", drawn by Zahn himself in 1922, is the basis of his work.

According to "Arbeit" he began his theological studies in Basel, where he also heard Hagenbach, Ch. J. Riggenbach, Immanuel Stockmeyer and Auberlen. Three semesters followed in Erlangen, where he was especially attracted by Hofmann and also heard Franz Delitzsch and participated in the oral and written exercises of the exegetical seminar he directed. He spent his last year of study in Berlin, especially studying theology under Nitzsch and history of philosophy under Trendelenburg. Zahn judged about Hengstenberg-Berlin: "E. Hengstenberg formed an unpleasant contrast to this venerable man [C. J. Nitzsch] with his lecture, which lacked any outward dignity as well as any humor. I was only able to endure him for a few hours."

After completing his studies, Zahn first followed a profession as a teacher at the Gymnasium of Neustrelitz. From 1865 to 1877 he was active at the University of Göttingen, where Ritschl was cranking out his disbelief. In 1877 Zahn received a professorship in Kiel, and already in the following year he was in Erlangen, from where he went to Leipzig in 1888, only to return to Erlangen as early as Easter 1892.

Theologically Zahn belonged to the "Erlangen School". From the beginning he was a great admirer and admirer of D. Hofmann, at whose hundredth birthday celebration in the auditorium of the Friderico-Alexandrina on December 16, 1910 Zahn held the ceremonial address, in which he tried to "portray Hofmann as a man, Christian and academic teacher". He also owed his appointment to Erlangen primarily to D. Hosmann, who, as Zahn remarks, "had already repeatedly expressed to his colleagues before his last illness that he wished me [Zahn] to be his successor". Of his student days in Erlangen, Zahn writes: "Around Easter 1856, I went to Erlangen for three semesters, where at that time, of the 500 to 550 students of all faculties, nearly 300, including about 130 non-Bavarians, belonged to the theological faculty. [In the summer of 1857 there were altogether 549 students, 287 theologians, including 136 non-Bavarians]. That this preponderance of the theological faculty, unprecedented in German universities since the seventeenth century, and the founding of an "Erlangen School' was essentially an effect of the teaching effectiveness of J. Chr. K. Hofmann, requires no more proof. There is not enough space here to show once again that the cause of such a lasting effect was not a dazzling lecture or the exceedingly manifold talents and education of this teacher, but the man's personality full of character, who devoted the whole strength of his outstanding intellect and his unshakable religious and ethical conviction to every issue forced upon him by his professional position. Only one thing should not remain unsaid, that Hofmann, above the brilliant outward success of his teaching activity, never denied his personal participation to the individual listeners who asked him for enlightenment about things not understood and asked him for advice, and that he acknowledged with touching modesty every sound thought and every scientific achievement of his students, and on the other hand abhorred all dependent repetition of his own as well as of foreign doctrines."

A complete list of Zahn's publications can be found in the "Zahn Bibliography. - Verzeichnis der literarischen Veröffentlichungen Theodor v. Zahns zu seinem achtztzigsten Geburtstag am 10. Oktober 1918 zusammengestellt und dargeboten von Freunden und Kollegen. 1918, 32 pp." Several titles may also be mentioned here: The Apostolic Symbolum. 2nd ed, 1893. The Permanent Significance of the New Testament Canon for the Church. 1898. outline of the history of the New Testament canon. 1904. sketches from the life of the ancient Church. 3rd ed., 1908. The Worship of JEsu in the Age of the Apostles. 5th ed., 1910. Zahn's chief work, however, is the great "Commentary on the New Testament," edited by him with the co-operation of other positive theologians. In the "A. Deichertschen Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig" have appeared by the same: Matthäus von Th. Zahn. 4th edition, 1922. Mark by G. Wohlenberg. 2nd edition, 1910. Luke by Th. Zahn. 4th ed., 1920. John by Th. Zahn. 6th ed, 1922. Acts of the Apostles, chs. 1-12, by Th. Zahn. 3rd ed., 1922. Acts of the Apostles, ch. 13 to conclusion, by Th. Zahn. 2nd edition, 1921. Epistle to Rome, by Th. Zahn. 3rd edition, 1924. 1st Epistle to the Corinthians by Ph. Bachmann. 3rd ed,

1921. 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians by Ph. Bachmann. 4th ed., 1922. Epistle to the Galatians by Th. Zahn. 3rd ed., 1922. Epistle to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon by Fr. Ewald. 2nd ed., 1910. Epistle to the Philippians by Fr. Ewald. 4th ed., 1923. 1st and 2nd Thessalonians by G. Mühlenberg. 2nd ed., 1908. pastoral briefs by G. Wohlenberg. 4th ed., 1923. Epistle to the Hebrews by E. Riggenbach. 3rd ed., 1922. 1st and 2nd Epistles to Peter and Judas by G. Wohlenberg. 3rd ed., 1923. The Revelation of St. John by Th. Zahn, chs. 1-5. 1924. Zahn concludes the aforementioned "Sketch" of 1922 with the words, "The mood in which I look back on both work (as teacher and writer) I find expressed in the sporadically transmitted pentameter of Solon: **γηράσκω *δ' alti πολλά διδασκόμενος*."** And how Zahn worked on restlessly is attested by the commentary on the Apocalypse before us.

Describing his work goal, Zahn says: "In the application to the theological faculty [Göttingen] with which I applied for the venia legendi (March 13, 1868), I expressed the intention to lecture on the books of the New Testament and the subsequent early church literature. The goal of my teaching and my studies, which I have not lost sight of to this day, is a historical understanding of the beginnings of Christianity based on independent research of sources. Since the first-rate sources for this have been handed down to us not as individual Christians, but as the New Testament, the history of the nascent New Testament canon, that is, in other words, the patristic literature, going back to the end of the first century, had to be studied at least until about 370."

With this, D. Zahn himself has indicated the field in which he has achieved mastery, as not only the introductions to his commentaries, but also his other writings abundantly testify. And the spirit in which Zahn approaches this work is not the radical spirit of subversion and contradiction that goes through history like an elephant through a china shop, rummaging through literature in a principled hostile manner in order to find material that he can turn into dynamite for the destruction of everything that has been handed down. The present volume, especially the introduction, also bears witness to the author's great familiarity with patristic literature. And the conclusion reached by Zahn is that the Apocalypse was written by the apostle John about 95 (94-96) AD. Of course, the fact that the Revelation of John was not recognized as apostolic in the first church without contradiction does not have the importance for Zahn that we still attach to it and that the church will never be able to overrule in spite of all research.

While Zahn's work is rich in various historical details, we miss contemporary theological excursions in it. For example, Revelation 1:5 would have provided an opportunity for a detailed explanation of the satisfactio vicaria. What is offered on page 173 is not sufficient. But Zahn, as a disciple of Hofmann, probably shares Hofmann's doctrine of atonement, according to which, as is well known, the suffering of Christ is denied the character of vicarious punishment and expiation. As far as the true deity of Christ is concerned, it is said here concerning Revelation 1:6: "After the detailed exposition of the goods and blessings which have been acquired by Christianity through Jesus and which will come to full fruition through His promised return, John directs the reader's gaze back to the sublimity of God over all becoming and passing away, which is testified to in v. 4 (after Ex. 3:14), and which does not apply in the same full sense to Jesus and to the Spirit of God and Jesus." Are these words, which we have emphasized, intended to teach subordinatianism, as advocated, for example, by Kahnis and Hofmann? In the above-mentioned lecture, "The Worship of JEsu in the Age of the Apostles," Zahn proves conclusively that JEsus was truly worshipped by His disciples and believers from the very beginning. Adorants, however, are also found among the Unitarians. And yet worship is due to Christ only when he is consubstantial with the Father. To bring this out clearly in a digression, and to prove it from Scripture, would have been one of his opportunities here. How all Christians would rejoice and be tremendously strengthened in their faith, if D. Zahn would have explained this.

would make up for it and would confess roundly and clearly to the Deity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, who is consubstantial with the Father, and also to the satisfactio vicaria!

The present volume, whose individual exegetical comments we cannot deal with here, deals only with the first five chapters of the Apocalypse. That the interpretation of the remaining sections, especially that of chapter 20, will not move theologically in the old Lutheran paths is already shown by the criticism of Luther in the introduction. Praisingly, it is first remarked here: "And yet [although Luther did not consider Revelation "apostolic" and had declared: "My spirit cannot send itself into the book"] he had translated the Apocalypse undauntedly and in a language whose verve and power are not inferior to the original. And how finnily and intimately, in his "Song of the Holy Christian Church,' beginning "She is dear to me, the worthy maid, and cannot forget her'r" (Erl. 56, p. 350), he has been able to interpret the bold vifion pictures of Apocalypse 12 in the tone of the popular song!" Then follows a criticism which says, among other things, "But to a reasonably harmonious understanding of this book and of Bible prophecy in general Luther did not bring it to his end. He did not find time to make a serious effort to do so. On the other hand, he established exegetical guiding principles in early times and maintained them to the end, which could not lead to the goal." Like the Erlangeners and the Moderns all, Zahn does not agree with Luther in the doctrine of the Antichrist and the Millennium, which, of course, bears its fruit in the interpretation of the prophetic portions of Holy Scripture. It should only be noted that pages 193-208 are missing from the copy we have. F. B.

The unaltered Augsburg Confession, German and Latin, according to the best manuscripts in the possession of the signers. Critical edition with the most important variants of the manuscripts and the textus receptus. By Paul Tschackert. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig. M. 7.

In this publication, which appeared years ago, Tschackert offers a German and Latin text of the Augsburg Confession, which he believes to be the handwritten text that was read before the emperor and the empire in the episcopal palace at Augsburg on June 25, 1530, and handed over to the emperor. "In producing this text," Tschackert writes, "I have relied only on contemporaneous original copies of the Confession; they all rest today in archives and have been lent to me on the local university library (in Göttingen) for my use." Tschackert is also of the opinion that the text he offers will not have to be altered by finding unknown manuscripts, since it is completely secured by nine authoritative parallel manuscripts independent of each other. In four clearly arranged parallel columns, the German text is printed on the left side of the book (on the left the critical and on the right the received text of the Formula of Concord) and on the right side the Latin text (on the left the critical and on the right the received text). In the deviations of Tschackert's text from that of the Formula of Concord, it is always only a matter of readings and additions, by which the doctrine itself is not in the least affected, as was the case with the Variata of 1540. (Cf. Triglotta, Hist. Introd., p. 21.) Also.

the 63-page introduction offers valuable treatises, as shown, for example, by the following headings: "The transmission of the text of the A. K." "The origin of the two original manuscripts of the A. K." "The handover and disappearance of the two original manuscripts of the A. K." "Description of the manuscripts of the A. K. found so far" "The manuscript of the French translation of the Latin Confession." "Titles, Numbers of Articles, Headings of Articles, and Signatures of the Confession." Accompanying Tschackert's writing are two specimens of writing, a Latin one from the Codex Latinus Norim- bergensis and a German one from the German manuscript "Nürnberg." F. B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Dr. A. F. Ernst †. On August 8, Dr. August F. Ernst, longtime professor and president of the Aortbwestern Oollexe of Watertown, Wis. passed away blessedly in faith in his Savior at the ripe old age of eighty-three. From the outline of his life in the "Ev.-Luth. Gemeindeblatt" of August 31st of this year, we communicate the following Data: August Friedrich Ernst was born on June 25, 1841 in Eddesse, not far from Peine in Hanover. His parents were Father Karl Ernst and Agnes, née Brackebusch. He graduated from the Gymnasium in Celle and studied philology and theology at the University of Göttingen. After teaching for a year at the Gymnasium in Clausthal, he decided to serve the Lutheran Church in the United States. After administering the practical pastorate near Brooklyn, N. Y., and at Albany, N. Y., he was called to what was then Northwestern University (now Northwestern College) in 1869. Besides Dr. Notz, who passed away two years ago, it was chiefly Dr. Ernst, through whose ministry the school grew and flourished, and gained a good reputation among the schools of our country. It was therefore a well-deserved honor that the faculty of the theological seminary at St. Louis conferred the title of doctor on this man who was highly deserving of the Lutheran Church as an educator and theologian. F. P.

II. Abroad.

Borough proposals of the Education Committee of the Australian Sister Synod.

The ***Australian Lutheran of*** July 2 reports: "The Educational Committee, or Board, created by General Synod at Tweedvale for the purpose of dealing with educational matters in connection with Concordia College and especially appointed to determine the scope of the work of the fifth professor, whose appointment Synod approved of, held its first meeting on June 12 and 13. All members of the board, nine in number, were present. Acting General President, Pastor Nichterlein, was elected chairman, and Pastor Homann secretary, of the board. A number of very important questions were thoroughly discussed. The Board very summarily dismissed the suggestion that we might give our boys only a preparatory training at Concordia and then send them to America for a theological course. Concordia is to remain a theological seminary. However, the Missouri Synod, in view of the fact that we are able to make graduates available for the mission-fields in India and China from time to time, is requested to consider at its next convention whether it might not undertake to pay the salary of one or perhaps two professors to be appointed by us, without exercising any control over our institution. The board also placed on record its sincere desire and cordial request that from time to time, and, if possible, for our next General Convention, the Missouri Synod might send a representative, preferably a member of the St. Louis faculty, whose visit would not only tend to strengthen the ties of brotherhood between us and our brethren in America, but who would also be able to offer valuable advice with reference to our college. The unanimous resolution of the Tweedvale synod to increase our present

teaching staff at Concordia shall be carried out as soon as possible. The Electoral Board was instructed to take the prescribed steps for nominating and electing a fifth professor, who shall be a theologian, and who shall chiefly teach English, German, Latin, and Hebrew. The board was also convinced that when the gymnasium, together with the Assembly Hall, will be built, as decided by Synod, a special room should be provided to be used as a laboratory. Other important questions dealing with educational matters will be discussed at the next meeting of the board, which will meet again probably in October. May our Lord richly bless His and our Concordia College!

The community paper "Auf der Warte", known for its alliance spirit, answers the question: "Lutheran or Reformed? Reformed! Luther, he says, established a twofold ethic (as the Catholics have their "double standard"), one for the "private citizen" and one for the "citizen of the state." "We Reformed reject this as a violation of the fundamental rules of morality." The moral law, he said, was a "universally binding greatness, above all reasoning, ruling over us in holy majesty." The Lutheran double standard, however, trims it according to time and circumstances to suit our needs: "It does not make sense to us [Reformed]" that the same action is praiseworthy one time and bad and criminal the next: "when the executioner executes a condemned man in the open marketplace, or when he slays his enemy in the dark forest out of personal revenge. Killing is killing, and sin is sin, whoever the perpetrator may be, and under whatever circumstances the deed may have been committed". The "A. E. L. K." remarks: "It is more interesting (than the detailed refutation of this obvious error) that from the circles where the emphasis on the denomination and the polemics against others were hitherto regarded as not in the sense of JEsu, because it was against the unity and gathering of the children of God, now the old controversy is brought forth: 'Lutheran or Reformed?' and the point is turned against Lutheranism. One can notice these points also in other places in our time. From all this it may be gathered that the differences of the denominations are not so even as some would suppose and wish. If we are to speak again, let us speak in God's name. The publicly raised question: 'Lutheran or Reformed?' is an admonition to Lutheranism to set before itself anew the faith handed down by the fathers of the Reformation and to testify with strength to the truth it has recognized." The "A. E. L. K." also has many sins of omission on its conscience, in addition to many sins of commission. For a long time now there can hardly be any question of a serious struggle of the same against the Reformed and the Uniate. It, too, has allowed itself to be deceived by the talk of love, which, wherever it was a matter of Lutheran concessions, was never anything other than masked cunning of the enemy. F. B.

Argentina and the Roman Church. Under this heading we read in the "Church Messenger" of our brethren in Argentina: "As our readers know, the Roman Church in Argentina is the State Church. The second article of the national constitution, as we know, reads: 'The federal government maintains the Roman Apostolic Catholic Church (cult).' Millions are given by the government from the money collected by taxes for the

Maintenance of the Roman Church. In return, the Argentine government is granted special rights by the Roman Church. For example, it may appoint the person of the archbishop for its country. Therefore, when some time ago the resident archbishop died, the Argentine government appointed a certain Andrea as archbishop, but he is persona non grata with the pope and his election was therefore not confirmed by the pope. Now, since the Argentine government wants the rights granted to it by the Roman Curia preserved, while the pope persistently refuses to confirm Andrea's appointment, tense relations have arisen between the government and the Roman See, which have not yet been settled as of this writing. Newspapers are even reporting the possibility of a separation of church and state. According to newspaper reports, the Pope has decided to abolish presidential law and place the Roman Church in Argentina on a new and firmer footing. The Pope is said to have even offered the cardinal's hat to the future Archbishop of Buenos Aires if his appointment is made jointly by the Argentine government and the Vatican. The Argentine President, Dr. Marcello T. Alvear, is said to have retorted that he would not sell the rights of the government for a cardinal's hat. Thereupon the Vatican is said to have agreed to an amicable separation on the model of Brazil, to which Dr. Alvear replied that the separation, if it came about, would proceed noisily, as it did in France at the time. The whole thing shows what an absurdity it is when there is a State Church, especially when the Roman Church is that State Church, and what a blessing it is when the State and the Church are separated. The "Evangelical Church Bulletin" of the La Plata Synod is of a different opinion. It writes in No. 16, among other things: "As the newest solution to the conflict (namely, between the Argentine government and the Vatican), the separation of church and state is proposed, a solution that would bring no advantage to Argentina. We are reasonably surprised at this statement of the "Evangelisches Gemeindeblatt". The separation would certainly bring great advantages to Argentina. First of all, the many millions that are annually thrown into the lap of the Roman Church would remain in the treasury, and with them the government could do many good things, e.g., improve the school system, and so on. Then all the inhabitants of Argentina who are not of the Roman confession, but have hitherto been compelled to support a church (for the money for the Roman church is collected by state taxes) which they abhor and reject in their hearts, would be freed from a bondage of conscience. Quite apart from the bondage of conscience, it also still remains wrong for the state to collect funds by taxation from all its citizens for the maintenance of the Roman church. Those of other faiths have to take care of the maintenance of their own church, and that they should then be compelled to maintain another church, which they detest, can never be right. It is also an injustice against totally unbelievers who do not want to belong to any church if they are forced to pay church taxes. For these reasons alone, state and church should always remain separate. The main reason, however, why state and church should be separate is because mixing them is against God's Word. Christ says, "Give therefore unto Caesar,

What is Caesar's and what is God's', Matth. 22, 21. Here the Savior Himself makes an exact distinction and does not want to mix the state and the kingdom of God on earth, the Christian church. Further, when Christ was asked by Pilate concerning His kingdom, He said: 'My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight to keep me from being delivered to the Jews; but now my kingdom is not from hence,' John 18:36. Here Christ speaks as plainly as possible that his kingdom has nothing in common with the world kingdoms, and therefore must not be mixed. Such a mixture of state and church cannot take place without sin. The church has not to do with worldly things, and the state has not to do with ecclesiastical things. So long as citizens do not become dangerous to the State through their religion, it must be indifferent to the State what religion they belong to and how they practice it. That it is not good when State and Church are mixed, is finally also shown by experience. One only has to think of Henry IV. How miserable was the state in the Middle Ages, when it was subjugated by the Pope! And how sad it is still today with the national churches, which are governed by the state! The first Christian churches certainly had nothing in common with the State, and yet they flourished wonderfully. The church thrives best without interference from the state, and conversely the state thrives best without interference from the church. Therefore, all sincere Christians can only wish that here in Argentina, too, the State and the Church will finally be separated."

Concerning the modern Weltanschammgswesen write the liberal "Leipz. Neuest. Nachr." of March 31, 1924, under the heading "Epigonism": "When one encounters the word 'Weltanschauung', one is reminded of epigonism. Kaleidoscope-like, it swirls with moods, little feelings, irritations, all of which want to express a certain spiritual way of life. But it remains mere stammering and fragmentary. It is unfinishedness, decadence, and the longed-for grand line is least of all brought to a beautiful realization by fashionable borrowings from Far Eastern world views and from all kinds of occult weirdness. Hundreds of thousands have lost their religion and do not want to have any. Alongside this, however, there is the feeling that, after all, one cannot be without religion at all, and there are again God-seekers swarming about, and there is no lack of people who imagine that they can invent a new, quite modern religion off the cuff, so to speak. A wretched literary babble ripples around these things, epigone-like, really on the worst scale. It is in this connection that the broad-track new morality may be thought of. It is set by its delighted panegyrists on the most primitive instinct and impulse, and the ideal to many is the rabbit or the pigsty. This is most stupid and sad when the aesthetic cloak is spread over it. The other day in Leipzig such a modern-erotic sex was clearly rejected by the more respectable part of the theatre-goers with a vigorous and healthy "Fie! But it makes one think that such 'art' was allowed to be presented at all, and that it could be wildly applauded by a whole number of young people, of all people."

"The two ways in religious thinking" is the title of a writing by D. E. Grimm, in which, according to the "Theologische Literaturzeitung" (1924, 503), he teaches: "We find the two ways of religious thinking when we apply the two methods of induction and deduction to religious thinking. The next way is that of induction: we seek to come nearer to God, to find and grasp Him. The consciousness of dependence, the urge to worship (longing devotion), instinct of unity and longing for eternity are the means of induction. When the breakthrough to the comprehension of God and the existence of God takes place, the turn to deduction also occurs, and all things are now considered sub specie aeterni; all religious thoughts about the world and man are derived from the fixed thought of God. Only with this does religious thought come to a conclusion. Only with deduction does it gain greatness, force, and unity. But deductive thinking retains its limitations: its content is bound to induction. The final conclusions of deduction lead to impossible consequences: Abolition of all human self-activity and with it the killing of all morality. Deduction, which is not corrected by any new induction, must necessarily lead to dogmatic torpor, to scholasticism. Hence a mutual supplementation of deduction and induction is always necessary, that religious thought may possess both, closed force and fresh vitality." This is the way of all pagans, and it leads no one further than pagans have yet reached. True religious thinking is accomplished solely through faith in the Word wrought by God through the Word. With the Holy Scriptures, of which we become certain through faith, the new world of revelation opens up to man, of which no eye has ever seen anything, and no ear has ever heard anything from any experience, and no head, no heart has ever dreamed of anything by deduction or speculation.

F. B.

"Freethought Agenda." Under this title, "Auf der Warte" writes in No. 22: "After the freethought community has become a church, it is eager to create an ecclesiastical "usage" (liturgy) for itself, since this requires consideration for the "natural dispositions and needs of the human soul. A recently published consecration book contains forms for baptism, confirmation, marriage, funeral, which closely follow the ecclesiastical process down to the last detail. Parents and godparents are obliged by a handshake and an affirmative answer to questions such as: "Will you regard the child's spirit . . . as a splendid work of culture entrusted to you for development?" to "educate the child in the sense of free, undogmatic, worldly, life-enhancing views". As a 'pulpit greeting' serves the formula: 'Honourable urge to development, who leads all life and events upwards, exercise your eternal right on our brothers, the human beings: Faith delusion depart from their mind, sharpness of spirit direct their striving! . . .' The ecclesiastical "blessing" is replaced by the "life saying": "Holy meaning of life, let yourself be found in our destinies, however intertwined they may seem. Let us recognize you, urge to unfold, who leads all life and events upwards. Let us hear you, eternal harmony, and give us your peace! (So be it done!)' In the sample funeral form, the deceased is remembered as having 'sublime faith in life, which alone is

We believe in the universe, infinite in space and time, filled with unity, coherence and order. We believe in nature, as the unity of effects in space, ordered according to immutable, eternal laws. We believe in life, as the unity of all living and giving in time, ordered according to the laws of an infinite development from the simple to the formed, from the lower to the higher, and so on. We believe in humanity, as the highest stage of life, and in the becoming of the spirit in an infinite development from hatred to love, from error to truth. . . . We believe in reason and science, the supreme power of man. . . . We believe in the unity of all things, which guides us safely through life and death.'"

D. Girgenfohn-Leipzig said in a radio sermon on Pentecost: "But what gives us courage and strength to love God, even when sin and guilt come in between? That is the other love of God, the love of God for mankind, which was overwhelmingly revealed in Jesus Christ. On the cross a love is revealed that no man's heart has thought of. Here every sinner is convicted of his uncleanness, but not judged unlovingly, but the love of JEsu seeks precisely that which is lost. This love, which Paul himself experienced, is for him the Holy Spirit. This love permeates all Christianity on earth; it comes with the lights of the Christmas tree, in the darkness of Passiontide, with the Easter message, with the Pentecost message. She proclaims love, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." According to this, the Holy Spirit would not be a special person in the Holy Trinity, but only the sin-seeking and saving love of JEsu. F. B.

Concerning the theory of evolution, the anatomist Prof. Dr. Fick-Berlin explained: "Of course, you must be quite clear about the fact that the theory of evolution is not based on a fact, but only on an idea; an idea that has certainly had a very stimulating effect on science. But you must by no means elevate it to dogma. The embryological similarities can often be explained in such a way that one sees the basic material before one's eyes, just as the trees in the forest all look alike and are then nevertheless processed into the most diverse things. Sometimes, of course, something cannot be easily explained in this way." A medical student reported this saying home.

Atheism in the Medieval Papacy. Prof. D. Lemme-Heidelberg says in an article "Atheistic Religion" ("Geisteskampf der Gegenwart" 1924, p. 122): "The efforts for atheistic religion belong to modern times. Their actual existence can be ascertained in different areas at different times. Whether Frederick II." of the Hohenstaufe, is to be ascribed to it, is doubtful. Certainly he was so little constrained by religiousness in his politics and attitude to life that one could ascribe to him the infamous word of the three deceivers who would have fooled the world (Moses, Jesus, Mohammed). But that his scepticism went on to break with all faith in God cannot be proved. It is in the nature of such a hermaphrodite as "atheistic religion" that it has something fluid, hidden, one does not do wrong to say: hypocritical. One of the most repulsive figures of this character is Pope Boniface VIII, who has given Catholic apologetics more than enough cause to

He offers attempts at salvation, which, however, must remain completely in vain with this rejected man, who at the same time raised the papal claims to power to almost insane heights. His negative, partly blasphemous statements about everything that is sacred not only to the Catholic, but to every Christian, he did, however, as a private person, not as doctor publicus, as which he is supposed to have been infallible according to Catholic doctrine. But a pope who denied the Creator as well as a hereafter, who denied immortality and resurrection ('even the saints will no more rise than my horse that died yesterday'), who declared Christ to be a wise man and a great actor and exalted himself above Christ, who could not grant kingdoms like the pope, and who presented the three religions, which in the thirteenth century were used to compare, as human inventions, still seems strange as the bearer of the highest doctrinal authority. Whoever, like Shakespeare's Macbeth, could say that if God would only let him succeed here on earth, he would not care a straw about the hereafter, to him this God could be nothing but blind fate. The description of the atheistic religion is therefore factually perfectly correct for this wretch. Whether he should be judged an Averroist is very uncertain; as such he might not have been elected Pope. He probably belonged to those Italian circles living in antiquity, to whom, throughout the Middle Ages, Roman antiquity stood higher than Christianity, and whose anti-Christian sentiments gave no offence in the circles which glorified Rome. Boniface VIII sought to bring the Imperium Romanum to prevail; this made his irreligion and immorality pardonable in Rome." That Roman superstition is priestly fraud will seldom escape even well-educated papists. But if the saving Gospel is then lacking, atheistic unbelief is the result, even where outwardly the connection with the Church is not broken.

F. B.

Modern magic nonsense. The "Leipz. If it is true, as the letter claims, that there are about 280 fortune-tellers, clairvoyants and the like in Leipzig, and that spiritualistic mischief has even penetrated into serious Christian circles and is rampant in so-called 'good society,' then the church must be very seriously on guard here. Reference is rightly made to 3 Mos. 19, 31 and 20, 6, and the Satanic nature connected with these things is underlined. The Prussian Ministry of the Interior is said to have found that a high percentage of the permanent inmates of insane asylums are former spiritualists. Two harrowing experiences from pastoral care illuminate the seriousness of these questions: "A noble girl came to a pastor who was earnestly anxious to come to complete peace with God. The girl prayed the Penitential Psalm 51 fervently in order to reach her goal. One day she came to the discussion, agitated and distraught, and cried and cried: "I must take my life, I can't bear it any longer!" "What gave you that idea?" "It was told me eight years ago by a card-beater, that I would end by suicide." - A genteel lady who is seriously ill sends for a pastor to come to peace with God. Two hours he labors. Ver-

give! Then he asked, "Have you ever been to a fortune teller?" "I have the fortune teller come to my house regularly." "Do you also know that this is a mortal sin?" She laughed.' " (A. E. L. K.).

Luther painting by Lukas Cranach. The new Danish art magazine "The Collector" reports about a Luther painting by Lukas Cranach in the possession of a Copenhagen art lover. It informs us that after careful restoration the picture has proved to be a genuine Cranach, and one of the most valuable works of art by the Wittenberg master. "The background of the picture is blue, Luther's robe brown and dark green. The size is 53.6X34.8 vm. The portraiture is witty, fresh and beautiful in colour, the valeurs are exceptionally fine, the filling of the surface is done with sure taste and a conscious sense of the essential, the composition exceptionally eloquent. Among the various Luther pictures by Lukas Cranach, the picture gives the leader in a special way: in the whole composition, by the way in which the figure fills the surface, with the crown almost touching the upper edge of the picture, and in the representation of the strength of will traits of the heavy, defiant face, the movement of the enormous old man's head. Even the posture of the coarse, primitively painted hands tells of the powerful leader, the bold, conquering agitator, [!] With touching intimacy the artist has immersed himself in the study of Luther's gaze, which is at once melancholy and transfigured, burning-powerful and humble-resigning. The lowest piece of the painting with the inscription was certainly painted on later, in any case altered. The signature is typical of Cranach. However, the serpentine line has upwardly bent wings, whereas the artist used to bend it downward in his later years." (A. E. L. K.)

Concerning the number of Protestants in France, *the Mission Interieure* writes*:* "In the last days of the Empire, the number of Protestants was about one million, but after the loss of Alsace, only 700,000 to 750,000. The restitution of Alsace has brought us about 350,000 brothers in faith. Unfortunately, the Protestant population in the rest of France is in decline, especially in the countryside, where church life is lacking, and we may well say that there are about as many Protestants in France now as there were in 1870. It must not be forgotten that there are about 750,000 Protestants in the French colonies, nearly as many as in the mother country." F. B.

Number of Jews. According to Hickman's Universal Atlas, which has just been published, there are today 13.5 million Jews (0.8 per cent of all the inhabitants of the earth). Of these, 10.5 million (2.3 per cent.) live in Europe, 780,000 (0.08 per cent.) in Asia, 475,000 (0.3 per cent.) in Africa, 1,780,000 (0.8 per cent.) in America, and 20,000 (0.25 per cent.) in Australia. The most Jews live in Poland, 3,300,000 (11 per cent.), the fewest in Portugal, 600 (0.01 per cent.); England has 280,000 (0.6 per cent.), France 130,000 (0.3 per cent.), Italy 40,000 (0. 1 per cent.), the German Empire 550,000 (0.9 per cent.), -Austria 350,000 (5.4 per cent.), of whom in Vienna over 300,000 (about 16.3 per cent.), Hungary 450,000 (6 per cent.), of whom in Budapest 22,000 (22.9 per cent.), the Czecho-Slovak Republic 360,000 (2.7 per cent.), etc. In Palestine, the territory contemplated as a nation-state, there are 80,000 (8.8 per cent.), in the United States of North America 1,600,000 (1.5 per cent.).

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. October 1924. No. 10.

The right love for the study of theology.

(Address at the opening of the academic year 1924-25 by F. Pieper).

At the beginning of a new academic year, it is appropriate to recall the right love for the study of theology.

There is a natural love of study, that is, of intellectual pursuits in general, even apart from the study of theology. Luther, in his well-known sermon on keeping children in school, 1) calls it "a fine pleasure for a man to be learned, even if he has no office, to be able to read all kinds of things at home, and to talk and deal with learned people. There is also a natural love for the study of theology, that is, for the study of things that belong to the field of theology. This love is found even in those who stand for their persons outside the Christian Church. The old and new rationalists may serve as examples. They stand as Unitarians, that is, as deniers of the Holy Trinity and of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, *extra* ecclesiam. But there have always been, besides spiritually and physically indolent rationalists, those who have treated with great natural love, and therefore with great natural diligence, orally and in writing, such things as we reckon to the theological field. Thoughts about God and divine things force themselves upon men involuntarily in consequence of the natural knowledge of God which is still innate even in fallen man. "Neque ulla gens tarn fera," says Cicero, 2) "nemo omnium tam immanis, est, cujus mentem non imbuerit deorum opinio." Hence even the heathen called such men among them as pondered and wrote about the origin of things and the worship of the gods theologians (*ϑεολογήσαντες*). 3) But of this natural love of occupation with theological things I will not now speak to you. If, after all, all these thoughts and aspirations remain in the natural-human sphere, in the sphere of spiritual

1) St. L. X, 445. 2) Tuse. Disputt. I, 13. 3) Aristotle, Metaphys. I, 3.

Darkness and the shadow of death, in the field of which the apostle Paul reminds the Ephesians, as former Gentiles, with the words, that they had then no hope, and were without God in the world, ελπίδα *μη έχοντες και α& εοι εν τφ κόσμω,*[4]) that their minds were Darkened
and they were alienated from the life that is of God.5)

It is otherwise with Christian theology. Christian theology has an object of knowledge peculiar to it, which even the rulers of this world have not thought of, and therefore Christian theology also has a motive peculiar to it for its study and for its practical activity in the public ministry of preaching, a motive which has never entered the heart of a natural man. Realize: the object of knowledge of Christian theology is JEsus Christ, the Saviour of the world crucified for the sins of the world. Its object of knowledge is the aeternus Dei Filius incarnatus in his satisfactio vicaria. Their object of knowledge is the εις *μεσίτης* between God and men, who out of wonderful divine love reconciled the whole lost human race to God by his life, suffering, and death, and whose expressed will is now that all who have known his love for sinners by faith in his word should, out of love to him, proclaim the far-saving message of love in the world. In short, the proper personal motive both for the study of theology and for its practical exercise in the public ministry of preaching on the ground of Christ's word, that is, on the ground of sola Scriptura, is personal love to the crucified Saviour, heartfelt love, wrought by the Holy Spirit, to Him who first loved us, μέχρι *θανάτου, θανάτου δε σταυρόν.* [6]*)*

Hence Christ's threefold question to Peter, who had denied his Saviour and had thus fallen out of the preaching profession: "Simon Johanna, do you love me?" To the answer, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee," Peter is restored as Christ's messenger by Christ's words, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep!" From this we see clearly: without personal love for the Savior of sinners, it really doesn't work! The world has for the messengers, who proclaim peace with God only through Christ crucified, neither gates of honor nor orders nor any concession, but contempt, enmity and persecution. If the messengers of Christ do not love their Saviour more than all that is in the world, they will not abide by Christ's word, but will either keep silent about the only saving message of Christ, or else mutilate and falsify it, and thus fall out of their Christian preaching profession.

Students of Concordia: You entered our Concordia with the avowed intention of once helping your Saviour in the preaching ministry.

4) Eph. 2, 12. 5) Eph. 4, 18. 6) Phil. 2, 8.

serve. You should therefore remember now and every day that your Savior addresses to all of you and to each one of you the question: "Do you love me?" Without this love in your heart, you will not succeed in your theological studies. But with this love in your heart, born of faith in the Gospel of Christ, you will overcome all obstacles that come at you from within and without. The state of affairs is this: You still have the παλαιός *ἄνθρωπος* about you, which is unwilling to the service of Christ, you
with indifference and sloth. But as soon as you place yourself in faith at the fire of love, so that your Saviour has loved you, holy zeal and willingness take the place of indolence, as expressed in Ps. 110: XXXX XXX, "your people are
Willingness." And as the apostle Paul writes in Gal. 2: "What I now live in the flesh, that I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." And as Luther confesses in the Catechism to the second article, which confession is indeed your confession: "I believe that JEsus Christ, truly God, born of the Father in eternity, and also truly man, born of the Virgin Mary, is my Lord, who redeemed me lost and condemned, purchased and won me from all sin, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with gold or silver, but with his holy, precious blood, and with his innocent suffering and death, that I might be his own, and live under him in his kingdom, and serve him." - Further, "The world that is in trouble still lures even the students of theology. The world also lures you, the students of Concordia, like Demas, of whom the Apostle Paul reports to his Timothy with a sorrowful heart, "Demas hath forsaken me, and hath loved this world. "7) But if you remember the question of your Savior, "Lovest thou me?" and thus the fact that your Savior has already accepted you to eternal life, the world loses its attraction for you. - Finally: even in our time the devil still goes about like a roaring lion and seeks to devour theological students in particular. But the fiery arrows of the evil one are extinguished as soon as you, in faith, bring him before your eyes who has bought you with his blood and called you from darkness to his wonderful light through his gospel.

Therefore, our prayer and supplication is this: Let the love of Christ, the love that he loved us with, and which is poured out into our hearts through faith, and sets our hearts on fire for love in return: let this love fill the hearts of us all. Let it fill the hearts of our youth, the hearts of those who are in manhood,

7) 2 Tim. 4:10.

and the hearts of those who have passed on to old age, that they may all continue and increase in the service of their Saviour. This love is also the godly motive both for the diligent study of theology and for the diligent and conscientious teaching of theology. "I will praise the LORD as long as I live, and sing praises to my God because I am here." 8) God grant it! Amen.

The so-called vengeance Psalms.

(Conclusion.)

We cannot agree with all attempts to solve the difficulty of the vengeance Psalms in this way. No one who believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures, in the scriptural sense of the word, can agree with such attempts. It is quite wrong to make such a distinction between the Old and New Testaments and to call the Old Testament inferior. All Scripture is God's Word. "All Scripture is inspired of God," says Paul in reference to the very Old Testament. Even the word, "The holy men of God spake, impelled of the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. 1:21, is said of the Old Testament Scriptures. The HER JEsus Christ, the true Son of God, has professed exceedingly often to have had the Scriptures as they were then before the Jews; has called them the Word of God; has testified that they cannot be broken; has called them by their principal parts: Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms; has quoted many passages, and pointed out their fulfillment. If the New Testament is inspired, so is the Old Testament, and vice versa. Thus it is wrong to speak of a different kind of inspiration in the Old and New Testaments, and to call the revelation of the New Testament a higher one than that of the Old. Certainly, we find in the New Testament a more perfect, clearer, and therefore more glorious revelation of God; but it is not another, but essentially the same as that of the Old Testament. In both we have the same law, the same gospel, though in different scope and distribution. It is simply not true what those theologians assert, that the moral level (moral level) of the Old Testament is supposed to be a lower, lower, than that of the New Testament. The same law given by Moses at Sinai was explained, interpreted and confirmed by our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount, not corrected and expanded. He, then, who asserts that the vengeance Psalms, like other parts of the Old Testament

8) Ps. 146:2.

He who thus divides, separates, and evaluates the Holy Scriptures as he pleases: he abolishes the concept of inspiration altogether, tears asunder the connection of the Old Testament with the New, and in principle removes from under the feet of the faithful all solid ground. If the so-called vengeance Psalms are at all part of the canon received and acknowledged by the Jews, they also belong to the Holy Scriptures, they are also God's Word, they are just as inspired, just as unbreakable, just as binding, just as authoritative as any other word of Scripture.

Nor can we be satisfied with the solution, likewise suggested in the above sayings, that these Psalms have indeed found a place in the Psalter, but, as it were, as a deterrent example, in that one must think of the condemnation of their spirit and their attitude, which is not expressly stated. Thus, after all, Ellicot says in the quotation brought above, "The Bible lets us see men as they are, without our having to take them [men] for our model in their thoughts and actions." Thus these Psalms would be placed on the same level with such portions of Scripture where deeds and sayings of ungodly men are presented to us without the condemnatory judgment standing right beside them, but leaving the judgment, that is, the condemnation, to the reader. It does not require much thought, nor great sagacity, to see the inadequacy of this solution, nay, to realize that it involves great danger to the principle of Scripture, and essentially destroys it. It is true that the Scriptures sometimes relate cases of sin without particularly emphasizing what is sinful, and directly designating them as sin, as, for instance, the incest of Lot's daughters, Gen. 19. But though the Scriptures abstain from expressing the judgment, yet there can be no doubt how it must turn out; precisely because the judgment is so self-evident, it is omitted. And even this is seldom done; as a rule the Scripture says briefly, "It was sin," "it displeased the Lord," or it indicates the sinfulness of the act by the punishment which follows. And these are always only isolated cases, brief reports. It is quite different with the vengeance Psalms. They are complete, self-contained portions of Holy Scripture. For this purpose they are not historical accounts, but songs, poems, which sprang from the religious feeling of the inspired writers and poets. Such Psalms should be thoroughly reprehensible, should contain wholly false, reprehensible things, should express a thoroughly sinful feeling, and should now have been tacitly inscribed in the Holy Scriptures as warning examples, without any intimation of this purpose? This hypothesis is absurd and fanciful. Who will say when and where a feeling or a hand-.

Is it written for imitation or warning? No, but "all scripture is profitable for doctrine, for chastening, for correction, for correction in righteousness." Certainly, the instances of sin mentioned in Scripture are written to us for warning, 1 Cor. 10, 11; but that God has had psalms written by wicked men, and put into Scripture without a word of warning, surely such an assumption borders on the ridiculous, and is the non plus ultra of improbability. It was not the unholy men of Satan, but the holy men of God, who spoke in the Scriptures, impelled by the Holy Spirit, 2 Pet. 1:21. If we add to this the fact that the poet and prophet David, according to the express testimony of Scripture, is the author of most of the cursing Psalms; that various of these Psalms are quoted in the New Testament, and in a manner wholly inconsistent with that supposition; that, finally, the Psalms were intended for use in public worship, and formed the prayer-book and hymn-book of Israel: we are done with the judgment of that hypothesis, and need say no more about it.

But how can we solve the difficulty that remains for our feelings, even for our Christian sense, when we read the curses and imprecations of the vengeance Psalms? It must be noted that in these Psalms, too, God speaks to men and for men. Thus it can only be said that the vengeance Psalms are an expression of the will of the law, of God's strict holiness and justice; that they make known to men his terrible wrath against sin, and finally also against sinners, if they do not repent, that they may be terrified at God's majesty and his zeal. Yes, to sinners, to persistent sinners, God is a consuming fire! And as he has given his thoughts and words to men through men, as he has often executed his terrible and shocking judgments on sinners through men, so here too he has put curses and imprecations into the mouths of men. The vengeance Psalms are law in the full sense of the word, and he who knows and believes in the holiness of God's law should not take offence at these expressions. Certainly, the law demands love even for enemies and evildoers. But should this prevent God from expressing through men his wrath against evildoers, and from putting imprecations in men's mouths against them? Probably the holy writers did not write these Psalms as will-less, thoughtless instruments, but really felt in their hearts what they wrote. Did they sin in this, transgressing against the commandment of love? No; for their hatred is directed against such enemies of their God as persist in their evil ways. Certainly the writers of those psalms wished that the wicked would be converted; but against obstinate, stiff-necked enemies and sinners

they hurl their curses and know themselves to be in accordance with God's will. On the whole, the following judgment on the vengeance psalms from McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia*, Ranb VIII, p. 755, is correct and good: "We here particularly notice what are called the vindictive psalms, namely, those which contain expressions of wrath and imprecations against the enemies of God and His people, such as Pss. 59,69,79, and which, in consequence, are apt to shock the feelings of some Christian readers. In order to obviate the offense, most of our pious commentators insist that the expressions are not maledictions or imprecations, but simple declarations of what will or may take place. But this is utterly inadmissible, for in several of the most startling passages the language in the original is plainly imperative and not indicative; see Ps. 59:14; 69:25,29; 79:6. The truth is that only a morbid benevolence, a mistaken philanthropy, takes offense at these psalms; for in reality they are not opposed to the spirit of the Gospel nor to that love of enemies which Christ enjoined. Resentment against evil-doers is so far from sinful that we find it exemplified in the meek and spotless Redeemer Himself. [Mark. 3, 5: "And he looked on them round about with wrath - μετ' ὀργης - and was grieved at their hardened heart,"] . . . Such imprecations in the psalms, however, are usually leveled at transgressors in a body and are uniformly uttered on the hypothesis of their wilful persistence in evil, in which case the overthrow of the sinner becomes a necessary part of the uprooting of sin. They are in no wise inconsistent with any efforts to lead sinners, individually, to repentance." This last thought in particular seems to be quite justified, and contributes not a little to the satisfactory explanation of those "hard speeches." Nothing prevents us from supposing that the Psalmist first desires the conversion and correction of his enemies; but if they are quite ignorant of this, let their sin and iniquity fall upon their own heads; so, if the Psalmist is to be safe from them, the ruin, the destruction, of the enemies must take place.

But does not the psalmist in the vengeance psalms often strike an entirely personal note? Does he not ask God for vengeance against his, the psalmist's, enemies, for punishment for the wrong done to him, while according to the law he should pray for them? To this we can only repeat what has been said above, that it is not impossible that the poet at first cherishes a conciliatory disposition against his enemies, but rather that his anger is directed only against the incorrigible and unforgiving. And there is one more thing that must be taken into account here, which gives the whole question a different shape and places it under a different point of view. For it is a generally accepted fact that the Psalms were intended for use in worship, for congregational singing and prayer. Many Psalms bear the heading XXXXX, "to the singing master" (Luther: "to sing to"),

and are provided with liturgical instructions. Thus it is not both the author, whether his name is mentioned or not, who speaks in this psalm, but the whole congregation, the whole full Israel. In the psalm and through the psalm the congregation of God gives expression to its feelings; the psalm composed by one becomes the property of the whole congregation. It is not disputed that such psalms are written by particular persons on particular occasions. God has chosen this very way of giving a word of God to His people, and at the same time of putting it into the mouth of the congregation as an expression of their religious convictions. In the vengeance Psalms, too, it is often the whole congregation that looks to God for protection against the enemies, for their destruction, and sometimes breaks out in imprecations. And it is the church of God that thus pleads; it is his people, the people of property, that call upon him! The people of Israel were the church of God; only here was found the right faith, the right worship, the true religion. If Israel perished in the battle against its enemies, the people of God perished, the sanctuary, the temple, the law, the true religion perished, Israel could not fulfill its destiny as a covenant people. And Israel knew all this very well. So the enemies of Israel were in a special sense the enemies of God. Considering this, can one find the pleas for the extermination of the enemies alienating, offensive? It was a question of the destruction of Israel as a covenant people, or of the destruction of the enemies who fell so eastward upon Israel; what good Israelite could do otherwise than ask for the destruction of the enemies?

Do the vengeance Psalms have anything in common with other books of Holy Scripture? Are there parallels and points of contact? Without a doubt. That the vengeance Psalms, which deal with punishment and revenge against the Gentiles, have much in common with the prophetic proclamations of punitive judgments against Gentile cities and peoples, needs no proof; sometimes expressions in the vengeance Psalms seem to be the echo of prophecy. Compare, e. g., Isa. 13:16, "Their children also shall be broken in pieces before their eyes, and their houses plundered, and their wives ravished," with Ps. 137:9, "Blessed is He that taketh thy young children, and dasheth them to the stone." But we may also refer to the New Testament to show that the vengeance Psalms are by no means isolated in their peculiar expressions. Let us think of our Saviour, the loving, gentle friend of sinners; what harsh words, what wrathful speeches, could he utter in holy zeal, when confronting the malice and obduracy of his enemies, who were at the same time enemies of the full, true service of God, yea, enemies of God, and thereby hardened themselves more and more in their malice! Seven times he cries woe on the Pharisees and scribes; he calls them

hypocrites, deluded leaders, fools and blind men, whitewashed tombs, serpents and vipers, and holds out the prospect of hellish damnation as their lot. Nor were the apostles afraid, in accordance with Christ's example, to pronounce harsh words, even imprecations, against manifest blasphemers and enemies of the gospel, especially against seducers and false teachers, who corrupt the souls of men with false doctrine, surpassing in vehemence the fiercest vengeance psalms. Compare the word of Paul 1 Cor. 16:22: "If any man love not the Lord Jehovah Christ, let him be anathema," that is, a curse! Now we know: Paul was burning with zeal to convert and save souls. Not unkindness and hatred, no, holy zeal pressed these words out of him; or rather, God had him write these words for the warning of men, just as in the Old Testament the vengeance Psalms. Compare also Gal. 1:8, 9, where Paul twice solemnly puts the curse, anathema, on the teachers of another gospel; *) and Gal. 5:12, where Luther translated, "Would to God that they also were cut off who disturb you!" It is also remarkable that St. John Apoc. 6, 10 hears the souls of those who are strangled for the word of God and for the testimony crying out with a loud voice, "O Lord, thou Holy and True One, how long dost thou judge and avenge not our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" This again reminds us that, according to Isa. 66:23, 24, even the inhabitants of the new heaven and the new earth, that is, the blessed, "go forth and behold the dead bodies of the people who have transgressed against God." All this shows: Not only according to the Old Testament, but also according to the New Testament, there is a righteous wrath against sin, and in a certain sense also against sinners who commit these sins, a justified calling upon God for punishment and vengeance when his honor and the good of souls require it, a holy delight in his righteous judgments.

The following are short remarks on some of the vengeance Psalms. Ps. 35, 1-8. Here the singer, David, complains about wicked, cruel enemies who bear false witness against him, do him evil for good, cause him heartache, attack him without cause. The Psalm fits well into the time of David's persecution by Saul. It begins with the words (Luther's translation is literal here): "O Lord, contend with my strivers, fight against my opponents. Take up your shield and weapons and set out to help me! Draw the spear, and shield me Against my persecutors; Say to my soul, I am thy help." The speech fits the mouth of a persecuted king, who calls upon God to take up arms for him himself

*) Ἀνάθεμα = actually votive gift; in the Septuagint always something, that which is doomed by God, or for God's sake, to perdition, to destruction.

seize. Now the speech becomes more violent and turns into a wish for punishment and judgment: "May those who desire my soul be ashamed and become a disgrace. Let those who seek my misfortune draw back and be put to shame. Let them be as chaff before the wind, By the angel of Jehovah thrusting them. Let their way be darkness and slippery, By the angel of Jehovah pursuing them. For without a cause have they hid their net for me; without a cause have they digged a pit for my soul. Let destruction (ruin) overtake him, because he knoweth it not; and let his net, which he hath hid, take hold of him; with desolation (din?) let him fall into it," vv. 4-8. - In v. 4 we find the formula so often occurring, "They must be ashamed and put to shame," etc.; that is, let the enemies be brought to nought in their wicked attempts - surely a fully justified prayer. The next verses are figurative; the speech is highly poetical. The enemies are thought of as a hostile army. David prays that God would so direct it, that this train, so proudly marching up, should yet turn to flight, as chaff flies before the wind; that the army, in fleeing, might fall into dark, slippery ways, which, of course, would add to the confusion. The angel of the LORD, who once broke the wheels of Pharaoh's chariots (Ex. 14, 25), may he also bring this hostile army into wild disorder. The enemies have set a net for the poet without cause, have dug a pit; so may they also be seized by this net, brought down by this pit, and fall in with a roar. In v. 8 the enemies are thought of as a heap; hence the designation is in the singular. - We see that the poet is not concerned with revenge on his enemies, but with protection and help from them, and this help can only be offered by God. David did not speak thus in a fit of vindictiveness. He appears in Biblical history as a noble-minded, magnanimous man, who twice spared his mortal enemy Saul; if once he was about to give vent to his anger, as against Nabal, 1 Sam. 25, it required but a gentle prompting of his conscience to dissuade him. How much more, if he composed psalms from God's impulse! Delitzsch, in his commentary on the Psalms, rightly says: "It is unthinkable that the unholy fire of personal passion should be mingled with the holy fire of his love of God." Add to this the fact that David here, as God's anointed heir to the kingdom, stands opposite to King Saul, who is alienated from God; that with David's destiny the continuance of the church, the future of Israel, coincides, or at least is connected. Another quotation from Clark's *Commentary* on the *Whole Bible*, III, on this Psalm: "The imprecations in these verses against enemies are all legitimate. They are not against the souls or eternal welfare of those sinners, but against their schemes and plans for destroying the life of an innocent man; and the holiest man may offer up such prayers against his adversaries."

In Ps. 83, 10-18 (Assaph the poet) we have a completely different picture. The psalmist appeals to God for help against the enemies of Israel, vv. 1-3. Those enemies make a plot against Israel; they say, "Let us cut them off, that they be no nation, that the name of Israel be no more remembered!" V. 6. Vv. 6-9 the poet describes these enemies. It is a great league, a coalition, that threatens Israel: Edomites, Ishmaelites, Moabites, Hagarites, Geballites, Ammonites, Amalekites, Philistines, those of Thrus, and Assyria has also joined them. Such a league of nations for the destruction of Judah is reported to us 2 Chron. 20, 1 ff., from the time of king Jehoshaphat. It is strange that according to 2 Chron. 20, 14 the spirit of the Lord came upon Jehaziel, one of the children of Assaphah, and drove him to prophesy victory. Ps. 83 is written by Assaph or an Assaphite; so this Psalm seems to be based on that historical event. So this is the state of affairs: a coalition, a league of nations, against Judah! After the Psalmist has lamented this to God, he asks God for protection and help: "Do to them as Midian, as Sissera, as Jabin at the brook Kison! Destroy them at Endor; they became dung to the field. Make them, their nobles, like Oreb and Zeeb, and like Zebah and Zalmunna all their princes, who say, Let us take possession of the dwellings of God! My God, make them like the whirlwind, like stubble before the wind! As fire burneth the forest, as flame scorcheth the mountains, so pursue them with thy weather, and with thy wind terrify them! Fill their faces with shame, that they may seek thy name, O Jehovah! They must be put to shame, and be afraid for ever and ever, and be put to shame, and perish, and know that thou, thy name, Jehovah, thou alone art supreme over all the earth," vv. 10-19. The Psalmist prays God to let Israel again win a glorious victory, as once in the days of the Judges; may He again, as then, thoroughly put to shame the enemies. It is a question of being or not being for Israel; the enemies are determined to take possession of the land and dwellings of God. So may God make Himself out to destroy, as with a weather, a whirlwind, a fire, the enemies! Who could take offence at this prayer? Nor must we overlook the expression, "That they may seek thy name; that they may know that thou, O LORD, art the Most High!" It is not against the salvation of the enemies that the poet prays; on the contrary, he desires that these very blows should make the enemies conscious that Jehovah alone is the one, true God. He thus virtually asks for their enlightenment and conversion.

Ps. 69:23-29 is a "vengeance psalm" κατ' *ἐξοχήν*, The imprecations which it contains are unparalleled in scope and awfulness. But to him who believes in Scripture, in its inspiration, in prophecy and fulfilment, the difficulty resolves itself in a thoroughly satisfactory manner. If, for instance, when we read this

If a feeling of uneasiness comes over us in the 22nd Psalm, it is to be put to the account of our foolish, carnal reason. The Psalm is Messianic; it prophesies of the coming Redeemer; indeed, in it the suffering and subsequently exalted Christ speaks as in the 22nd Psalm. Next to the 22nd Psalm, no other Psalm is so often referred to in the New Testament as the 69th Psalm. V. 6: "They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of my head" was fulfilled in Jesus according to John 15:25. When JEsus drove the sellers out to the temple, according to Joh. 2, 17 V. 10a was fulfilled: "I am jealous to death for your house." Also 10b: "The reproach of them that revile thee fall upon me" is according to Rom . 15, 3 was fulfilled in Christ in His willing suffering. The imprecation v. 26: "Let their dwelling be desolate," is according to Apost. 1, 20 was fulfilled in Judas Iscariot. V. 23. 24: "Let their table become a snare," etc., has gone forth according to Paul (Rom . 11, 9. 10) in the rejection of Israel. Still other points of contact are found. Compare, e. g., v. 22, "They give me gall to eat, and vinegar to drink in my great thirst," with Matt. 27:34, 48, and other passages; and v. 13, "They that sit in the gate wash of me, and in the taverns they sing of me," with the mockery of JEsum by the enemies, etc. There can be no doubt: in this Psalm Messiah speaks through David's mouth. This is of the greatest importance in judging this psalm. Now the imprecations: "Let their table be a snare before them, and a trap for the careless. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not; and let their loins be troubled for ever," v. 23. 24. These words Paul quotes Rom . 11, where the rejection and hardening of Israel is spoken of. This is an imprecation, a terrible imprecation. Their table, their richly set table, shall become a snare to them, and ruin in the midst of their good life, while they sit carelessly by it-they who give it vinegar and gall! Their eyes shall be darkened. Spiritual darkness is meant; compare the so often quoted prophecy Isa. 6. In short, the terrible judgment of hardening is threatened and desired for Israel. In the first part of the Psalm the suffering Christ remembers His sufferings and His enemies; in the second part, from v. 23, He turns with terrible imprecations against the enemies of Christ and murderers of Christ. We know that the judgment of hardening is preceded by self-hardening; but he who will not hear and see shall not see and hear; this is God's will, cf. Isa. 6. This judgment is here threatened and desired of the Jews by their spurned Messiah: "Pour out thy wrath upon them, and let the fire of thine anger smite them. Let their camp be laid waste, and in their tents let there not be an inhabitant. For they persecute him whom thou hast smitten, And tell of the affliction of thy pierced ones. Put iniquity to their debt,

And they shall not enter into thy righteousness. May they be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written on with the righteous!" V. 25-29. Note that the same Christ who pleads on the cross, "Father, forgive them!" is here asking God to pour out His wrath and fury upon His enemies and murderers. This is a mystery of God, but a fact which he has revealed to us: the blessing persistently despised turns at last into curse; the grace persistently rejected turns into disfavor. And it is also God's will that it should so go; precisely because it is his will, it so happens. This is the divine judgment of hardening. The Jews themselves cried out, "His blood be upon us and upon our children!" and so it has come to pass. Incidentally, Christ also quotes the word, "Their eyes must be darkened," that is, the word of Isaiah, when his disciples asked him why he spoke to the people in parables; he knew, therefore, that his preaching would also contribute to the execution of the prophesied judgment of hardening upon a part of the people. According to the testimony of Scripture, v. 26 was especially fulfilled in Judas, in whom, as it were, all the hatred, all the wickedness of the enemies of Christ culminated. But also in the whole people: how their tent, their city, became desolate at the destruction of Rome! V. 27 gives the reason for these curses: the one smitten of God, smitten for them, they pursued with hatred, mockery, and malice. On v. 28, "Lay blame to their iniquity," compare Rom . 1, 24. it is God's way that he causes persistent sinners to fall into greater sin for just punishment (this also belongs to the judgment of hardening); but if it is God's way, it is also his will of law, so he may also make known and pronounce this will upon sinners. By their deprivation of God's grace, and their continual sinning, it happens that they do not enter into God's righteousness, v. 28. That God would blot them out of the book of the living, might in itself mean that God would strike them out of the number of the living; so some interpreters translate, in an endeavor to weaken the imprecation. But one can hardly avoid understanding the expression XXX XXX in the sense in which it is so often used in Revelation, namely, as the book of life in which the names of the blessed are inscribed; the parallelism in the second half of the verse, "May they not be written out with the righteous," does not well admit of any other interpretation. But it finally comes to one thing; the death of the hardened is not a blessed one. These curses, too, were literally fulfilled in Israel, though God left Himself a remnant after the election of mercies.

In Ps. 109, 6-20 there is again a series of the most terrible curses imaginable. According to the testimony of the book of Acts,

which (1, 20) v. 8 refers to: "Let another receive his office," the whole imprecation is to be referred to Judas Iscariot. In addition, it is only one person against whom the psalmist turns. Thus what has been said about Ps. 69 would have to be repeated mutatis mutandis about this Psalm. And if in this Psalm the imprecations are also extended to the parents and children of the person concerned, we can only cite Ex. 20, 5, that God visited the sin of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hated him.

Other Psalms that could be counted among the vengeance Psalms are Ps. 59, 79, and perhaps also Ps. 58, 137, etc. In general, what has been said will also be applicable to them, taking into account the occasion, the purpose, the content of these Psalms. The imprecations and threats of punishment in the 79th Psalm are easily explained by the state of highest tribulation by powerful enemies, in which, according to the Psalm, Judah and Jerusalem were at that time. When the poet, v. 12, expressly looks down God's retribution upon the neighboring nations, it is precisely for the reproach with which they have reviled him, the Lord. Not vindictiveness, but eagerness for God and God's glory speaks from these words. Concerning v. 6 of this Psalm: "Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the kingdoms that call not upon thy name!" we have an interesting example from the history of prose literature, communicated by Friedrich Nicolai. When in 1769 some preachers in Hamburg saw themselves induced to omit those words of the Psalms from the usual church prayers on penitential days, which gave rise to a rather heated theological feud, Lessing unexpectedly defended the use of those words among his friends, and made an effort to reconcile them with the words of Christ: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Challenged to do so, he finished in a few days "A Sermon on Two Texts, on Ps. 79:6, and on Matt. 22:39, by Aorick; translated from the English." This "sermon" was never printed; only some of Lessing's intimate friends got to read it under the seal of secrecy. Only the preface has been handed down by Nicolai from memory; this is an anecdote of the English soldier Trim, who several times calls a begging French invalid a 'trench dog,' but at last gives him all his money out of pity, to which incident Yorick, the mythical author of the sermon, then remarks: "It is clear, Trim hates the whole nation, which is hostile to his fatherland; but he can love any individual from it, if he deserves love." (Cf. Hugo Goering's introduction in the Cottaschen Lessing edition, 18th volume.)

Finally, the question: Are Christians allowed to use the so-called vengeance Psalms or to pray them? Why not? They have,

Like every word of God, their purpose. The Christian will be careful not to use these Psalms to maledict his personal enemies and adversaries. He thinks of the strict holiness and lawfulness of God when reading these Psalms. The supplications of Israel, calling for God's protection and help, become for him cries for help, supplications of the ecclesia pressa, surrounded by enemies and also often troubled from within. But may the Christian turn only against sin, never against sinners? Person and thing, sin and sinner, are closely connected, and may be easily separated conceptually, but not so easily factually. If the sinner will not leave off his sin, which is pernicious to the church of God, the danger to the children of God can often only be removed by putting a stop to the sinner either way, by conversion or by making him harmless. And for this also a Christian may and must ask good. Who would blame the Church of the Reformation for beseeching God, "Stop the murder of the pope and the Turk?" and, with evident reference to the Psalms, "Make their plots, O Lord, come to naught? Let them strike the wicked thing, And plunge them into the pit, Which they make thine for the Christian"? A hundred years later the church had to sing again: "Save, O Lord JEsu, save your honour, Hear the sighing of your church, Destroy the enemy's attempts and power, Who now persecute your teaching!" And even if the enemies have changed their shape in the course of the centuries, if it is now mainly ground-breaking error, soul-destroying false doctrine, against which the Church must turn, she still sings with complete justification in the spirit of Assaph's Psalms, "Tear, tear down, destroy, What against thy glory!" or, "Jesus, our Lord, arise, Scatter our enemies, And make them fall." *(Ev. Luth. Hymn-Book*, 262, 2.) You see, hatred or
The Church which sings and prays in this way is no more driven by vindictiveness than were the poets of the Psalms; it is concerned only with God's glory and honour, and with protection and security from its enemies.

Henry Hamann.

Literature.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. published:

1. 29th Report of the Southern Wisconsin District. 34 Cts. - The report offers two papers in German and English. The subject of the first is, "Heresy and Scripture Doctrine of Eternal Damnation;" the subject of the second, "On Visitations." The report of the school superintendent is also offered in detail.
2. First Synodical Report of the Oklahoma District. 34 Cts. - This report offers two papers. The first deals with the subject, "When Will Our Synodical Connection Be Pleasing to God?" the second, "The Assurance of Success for Lutheran Missions in Oklahoma."
3. The Lodge. By Carl Kurth. 3 cts.; dozen, 30 cts. - As is well known the lodges now for a long time try to catch also the school children into their nets!

The warning against the lodges must therefore begin in our schools. This is the main purpose of the present treatise. F. B.

Concordia, or *Book of Concord*. The Symbols of the Ev. Luth. Church. With Indexes and Historical Introductions. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Price: $3.50.

Once again a major work has been published by our Synod. The present book offers all the English found in the ***Concordia Triglotta***, that is, the extremely valuable historical introductions, written by D. Bente, the excellent translation of the Confessional Writings, the product of the joint labor of D. Dau and D. Bente, and the tables of contents. The format is the same as that of the ***Concordia Triglotta; in terms*** of number of pages, the volume is somewhat
more than a third as strong as the trilingual edition. Thus our Synod now possesses its own English edition of the Book of Concord, D. Walther wrote in 1854 in the "Lutheran," in a review of the English New Market edition of the Book of Concord: "We praise God for it as an unspeakable boon which he has thus bestowed upon the church of our adopted fatherland, and bless the dear editors for it in our hearts." The same feelings certainly move all members of the Missouri Synod, and many Lutherans outside of it, in view of this latest English edition of the Book of Concord. May the work soon be widely distributed and help powerfully to preserve genuine Lutheranism to the world! A.

Synodical Handbook of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 90 cts.

The German edition of the "Synodal Manual", revised by v- Fürbringer, has already been published in an earlier issue of "Lehre und Wehre". For the present careful English translation Dean Fritz deserves our thanks. This manual should now be diligently studied by all members of the Synod, including the laity; for among the first demands which are justly made upon every member of the Synod is that he should know the orders of the Synod of which he is and wishes to be a member. To such strangers, too, as desire to become acquainted with the Missouri Synod, this manual is indispensable. Here they can see for themselves whether Missouri really practices what it teaches, and whether her whole great Synodal machinery is permeated with Lutheran, i.evangelical spirit. F. B.

Divinations and warnings from the Proverbs of Solomon. Presented by D. C. M. Zorn. Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Saxony. M. 2.80.

These are again short, instructive reflections, which each time conclude with a prayer and song or hymn verse. They are not only suitable for private reading, but also for home devotions. To highlight just one passage, for example, the following is said about Prov. 16:4: "And the Lord makes even the wicked to live in the evil day, for His glory and honor. You must understand this correctly. The Lord makes no man ungodly. Nor does the Lord make any man 'an evil day,' a day of judgment and damnation: he destines no man from the beginning and irrevocably to damnation. But he who makes himself ungodly, and always stiff-neckedly resists the Holy Spirit, who calls him through the gospel to the grace of God in Christ, him the Lord sets on high, 'to the evil day,' that his, the Lord's, power may appear in him, "that his name may be proclaimed in all the earth, that he, the Lord, may bring glory to him, and make known the riches of his glory to those whom he has made vessels of mercy and prepared for glory, even to the faithful and righteous." (81 f.) F. B.

Eberhard Nestle's introduction to the Greek New Testament. Fourth Edition, completely revised by Ernst Dobschütz. With 20 manuscript plates. Vandenhöck and Ruprecht, Göttingen. 160 pages. Stapled: M. 5.40; hardback: M. 6.60.

In the "Preface" Dobschütz says: "Eberhard Nestle himself was able to publish three editions of his 'Introduction to the Greek New Testament' (1897,

1899, 1909), always improving and increasing, plus an English translation by W. Edie in the ***Theological Translation Library*** (XIII, 1901). . . . After Nestle's death (March 9, 1913), R. Knopf had taken over the new edition; when he too was called away (January 19, 1920), without having laid a hand on the work, the task was entrusted to me, with the express instruction to make the book more usable by thorough reorganization. The hardship of the times demanded, above all, abridgement. At first I thought I could get by with deletions and rearrangements. But in the course of time something completely new has emerged. ... I thought first of all of the students: it should be an introduction to their Greek New Testament, that is, to its text-historical understanding and text-critical evaluation. . . . I was concerned with the overview and clarity. Practicality had to prevail over reverence. Wherever I could, I followed Nestle's example, without noting it in detail. As far as possible, I have added the new publications since 1909, also those from abroad up to 1914. What has appeared since then was mostly unavailable to me; if the researchers from abroad want to see their publications taken into account, they must make them accessible to us. I was particularly interested in increasing and improving the samples of manuscripts. . . . The typesetting, which took ten months to complete, will hopefully be recognized as an extraordinary typographical achievement by the printers."

Apart from the manuscript plates including explanations, the indexes, bibliographical references, etc., the work falls into two parts: Textual History and Textual Criticism. What is offered under textual history, show, among other things, the following titles, first about the text until the year 200: autographs, duplication, textual changes, parts of the New Testament and their collection, textual editing, Marcion, Gnostics, Justin, Tatian, beginnings of philological textual criticism, translations, consolidation of the text, reviews, occidental text. From 300 to 600: Biblical persecution, imperial Bible procurement, transition to book form, scholarly adjuncts, sense sections, chapter division, Eusebius' lessons, Euthalius' editions for reading purposes, ecclesiastical readings, manuscript luxuries, specimen copies, textual condition, revision of old translations, new translations. From 600 to 1500: iconoclastic controversy and its effects, Byzantine imperial text and its forms, variant text forms, scholarly ingredients and commentaries, ecclesiastical reading books, manuscript production and destruction, manuscript equipment, translations, polyglots. From 1514 to 1624: beginnings of printing, Complutensis, Erasmus, Colinaeus, Stephanus, Beza, Polyglots, Elzevir. From 1624 to 1830: spread of the textus receptus, critical experiments, John Mill, Bengel, Wettstein, Griesbach, Matthäi. From 1830 to 1920: Lachmann, Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Stuttgart New Testament, B. Weiß, Blaß, recent editions, von Soden. The second part deals with textual criticism: its material and method. Material: manuscripts, translations, and the Fathers, so far as they offer the biblical text of the New Testament. Method: the external criticism, the internal criticism, and the conjectural criticism.

This work by Dobschütz, based on Nestle's research, represents in itself a great intellectual work. But more than that, it bears witness to all the tremendous work that has been done in the field of textual history and textual criticism of the New Testament. The material of New Testament textual criticism, says Dobschütz, "is as rich as scarcely any other work of world literature can boast." And although this research, quite apart from the higher, speculative and radical criticism, has not been done in a credulous, nay, in part not even in a benevolent and truth-open manner, and every word, nay, almost every letter of the New Testament has been scrutinized and critically analyzed over and over again, yet the Bible today still stands firm and immovable as the mountains of God.

Dobschütz, who is also not entirely lacking in the nisus for criticism (which is why his writing also wants to be read critically), writes: "Like everything that lives, the text of the Greek New Testament has also been in perpetual motion. Before Gutenberg's invention, every new copy was a new source of error even with the most scrupulous accuracy of scribes and correctors. Affectionate observers of intellectual life must only marvel how, with all these dangers, so much and usually so surely came out of us." "Generally means

the history of the text in these [first] fifteen centuries ever greater distance from the original text. But beside this, the latter still somehow remains." (59.) "The text in general stands firm; there are only isolated passages where doubts remain." (76.) "One need not be alarmed at the mass of witnesses, nor "at the multitude of variants: they diminish visibly above the work. Method copes with them and surely points the way to the goal: production of the original text." (118.) It should not be overlooked that in spite of all the variants, not a single Christian doctrine is somehow shaken by the textual criticism, even if some things are accepted in the criticism that, strictly speaking, do not need to be accepted, and e.g. in the doctrine of the Trinity, the passage 1 John 5:7, which Dobschütz also considers spurious, is completely excluded from the reasoning.

Concerning the conjectural criticism, which opens the door to arbitrariness and in the end brings nothing to a certain conclusion, Dobschütz writes: "So far it was necessary to decide between different readings. Thereby it was presupposed that in each case the original text was contained in one of them. But there are also cases in which the text, whether it has been handed down with or without variants, cannot be correct, where the logic of thought, the rules of language demand something other than what is given, which results from the examination of the variants as the oldest attainable text form. Of course, great caution must be exercised here: not every small objection to the text that has been handed down allows one to resort to remedial action by correction: one must first seek to understand the text thoroughly before declaring it corrupt. There is also often the danger that one improves the author himself, where one believes only to correct the tradition. . . . One will have to establish the following rule: a conjecture may only be used when it is absolutely impossible to get along with the traditional text; then, however, it must come as close as possible to it graphically or phonetically." Of course, even in the most extreme case, one must admit, with reference to such a conjecture, that perhaps the right thing has not been done.

The manuscripts from which the enclosed twenty plates are taken, find: Philadelphia papyrus, Harvard papyrus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Bezae Can- tabrigiensis, Codex Claromontanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Washington, Codex Sangallensis, Codex Bodleianus, Codex Petro- politanus, Erasmus' print, Codex argenteus, of Upsala, Syriac Lewis palimpseft of Sinai, odex Amiatinus (Laurentiana at Florence), Bible of Charlemagne in the British Museum, Sahidic manuscript in the British Museum, Armenian Gospels of Etschmiadzin D. 989, minuscule with the shorter ending of Mark.

Dobschütz concludes his work with the words: "The field (of textual criticism) is wide, the work great: few are the workers. The work is worthwhile for the sake of it; Bengel is right that gold depends on examining every grain, even the smallest. It is worthwhile in itself: nothing educates to objectivity like text-critical work. It is necessary to increase the material; there are still treasures hidden in manuscripts, in translations, in fathers. It is necessary to sift through the material: D. Southern's classification urgently requires re-examination in detail. The ever finer development of the history of the text, the ever more careful working through of the textual criticism is necessary. The goal remains the recovery of the text as the authors of the New Testament writings intended it. Whether this can be achieved must be examined. In the meantime, the oldest textual tradition is to be taken sharply into account, not forgetting that even this is often ambivalent. True scholarship makes humble. ελεος τώ γράψαντι- σοφία τοῖς ἀναγινώσκονσι' χάρις τοῖς ἀκούουσι' σωτηρία τοῖς κεκτημένοις- αμήν. " F . B.

The publishing house of the Schriftenverein, Zwickau, Saxony, has sent us:

1. "The International Association of Serious Bible Students." 6 ice. - This little book by P. H. Stallmann-Berlin thoroughly and skillfully combats the enthusiasm of the Russellites.
2. The two tracts we have previously recommended, "What hast thou done with thy Sundays?" and "Indispensable to every man"-the latter an exhortation to earnest penitence. F. B.

From the publishing house of Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Saxony, has reached us:
1. "Ev.-Luth. Hausfreund Calendar 1925." 20 Cts. - The editor of the 41st volume of this calendar founded by D. O. Willkomm is Prof. Martin Willkomm. The reading material is a healthily Lutheran one. Special consideration is given to Luther's entrance into marriage on June 13, 1525.
2. Luther's writing "A simple way to pray". 5 Cts. - This wonderful little writing, which Luther wrote "for Master Peter, barber", should still be read diligently today by all Christians, young and old. It warms the heart and loosens the tongue to prayer. F. B.

Flying letter of evangelical words to the youth about the bliss of such children and young people who convert early. By Ernst Gottlieb Woltersdorf. 18th edition. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl. 180 pages. Stapled: M. 2; hardback: M. 3.20.

E. G. Woltersdorf was important not only as a preacher, but also as a songwriter and edifying author. He was born in Berlin on May 31, 1725. In 1748, despite his youth, he received the second pastorate in Bunzlau. Here he preached of the all-salvific grace in Christ's blood and righteousness. The result was a mighty movement and such a large attendance that soon preaching had to be done in the open air. The hours of edification, which Woltersdorf also established, increased to ten a week.

He took care of the youth with special love. "With the children," he said, "we will still chase the devil out of Bunzlau." The "Fliegende Brief" ("Flying Letter") which we have in front of us, bears the date: "Bunzlau, on April 12, 1752." Of his 35 edifying writings, this letter is also by far the most widespread. It is, after all, the eighteenth edition now presented by the Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung! "The blessings," says the Meuselsche Handlexikon, "are not to be uttered, which this little writing has bestowed and still bestows far beyond the borders of Germany." It is a mighty, heart-rending exhortation to youth not to sacrifice their fair young years to the devil and the world, but to consecrate them to Christ, their Saviour. On 180 pages in small print it offers a great abundance of thoughts, all of which are focused on the theme of the great happiness of those who serve the Saviour from their earliest youth. Of course, as is the main fault of the Pietists everywhere, this book is not free from many a false discourse concerning conversion and from the mixing of law and gospel, nor from the mixing of adiaphora with things that are in themselves reprehensible. For instance, p. 28, "Playing, dancing, jesting, laughing, shall" (in the judgment of the children of the world) "not be unrighteous." - To our pastors this Schrist offers a rich treasure trove for all kinds of lectures in their work with the youth, which we must not miss after all. It was with the youth in the schools that Luther won the Reformation; it was with the youth in the schools that our fathers broke the way for Lutheranism in America; it is with the youth in our parochial schools that we shall be victorious in the future also. F. B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Prof. D. E. A. W. Krauß, † Our highly esteemed and beloved colleague D. Krauß passed away shortly after midnight on October 9 after only one day of illness. We share here for the time being only a curriculum vitae written by himself and extending to the year 1913. "I, the undersigned, Eugen Adolf Wilhelm Krauß, was born on June 4, 1851 at Nördlingen in the Kingdom of Bavaria. My parents were teachers

Georg Friedrich Krauß and his wife Regina, née Bergtold, from Westheim in Mittelsranken. When my father was transferred to Augsburg as an elementary school teacher, I attended the German school at St. Jakob and St. Ulrich for about two years. Then I entered the pre-school of the St. Anna-Gymnasium and remained at the Latin school of this institution for another three years. Since my brother Ludwig, who was several years older, had in the meantime entered the Catholic grammar school at St. Stephan's in Augsburg, I also completed my grammar school studies there in 1869. I received confirmation lessons from the church councillor Dr. Aug. Bomhard, who also confirmed me at St. Jakob's in 1865. As a high school student I had wavered for a long time whether I should turn to mathematics or theology. When I graduated, I had decided on theology. From 1869 to 1873 I studied theology at the universities of Erlangen and Leipzig. My theological teachers in Erlangen were mainly D. Hofmann, Frank, Thomasius, D. Zezschwitz and Plitt; in Leipzig Delitzsch, Luthardt, Kahnis and Hölemann. Already as a student I had become accurately acquainted with the Löheans of the Bavarian Landeskirche, and also quite accurately with the writings and theology of their American opponents, the Missourians. When I finished my theological studies in Leipzig, it had become clear to me that I could not work and stay in the Bavarian Landeskirche, because in it neither the Gospel was preached in harmony according to pure understanding, nor were the sacraments administered according to the Scriptures. On the contrary, the church regiment nurtured and protected evident false teachers on the university chairs and in the pulpits, and it censured pastors who suspended false believers and unbelievers from the Lord's Supper and expelled them from the national church. Even before completing my theological studies in Leipzig, I therefore declared my resignation from the Bavarian State Church. It was with a heavy heart; for I had, in spite of everything, owed her much. At that time I saw two possibilities before me: first, to accept a position as a house teacher in the Baltic provinces, which a noble lady friend of mine from Erlangen was willing to arrange for me with pleasure; then the other, to go to America and to seek a church ministry there within the Missouri Synod. To the latter I had been encouraged by Prof. C. F. W. Walther, with whom I had exchanged letters for some years. My father also saw this as preferable to my going to Russia. In the late autumn of 1873 I left Germany and arrived in New York at the beginning of November. My plan at that time to travel directly to St. Louis to study for a short time at Concordia College was thwarted by the request of a pastor who was a friend of mine from Germany at that time, and who asked me in a letter given to me by Father St. Keyl to come to him in Grafton, Wis. for a few months until he had fully recovered from his illness. So, for the time being, I sent my library to a Lutheran company in St. Louis, willing to see it again there soon; but I myself went to Grafton. But the recovery of that friend was delayed. But since the neighboring congregation at Cedarburg had become vacant due to the departure of its pastor, T. Rösch, and called me, I accepted the appointment in God's name, which at the same time enabled me to serve Graston on a temporary basis. After I had been invited in a colloquium, which

I was ordained and inducted in Cedarburg in 1874, and also received into the Synod in the same year, but remained in Cedarburg only until September, 1875. I remained at Cedarburg, however, only until September of the year 1875. Shortly before and during the Synod of the Northwestern District, held at Watertown, Wis. in 1875, I received two callings: the one through Father F. Sievers, Sr. who called me as Indian Missionary of the Missouri Synod, the other, conveyed through Father Andreas Hörger at Memmingen, to the free Lutheran congregation of the late Pastor G. Fr. Haag in the Grand Duchy of Baden. I accepted the latter profession, but before that I married my dear wife, Juliane Philippine Ottilie, née Wille, from Freistadt, Wis. on August 29, 1875, and then immediately started with her on the journey to Europe. I worked at the free Lutheran congregation in Baden from my home in Sperlhof for a little over four years. Two little daughters, Elisabeth and Ottilie, whom God's goodness gave to our marriage there, died in Baden and rest in the churchyard in Wilferdingen. Towards the end of the year 1879, at the beginning of which the Seminary Director Lindemann in Addison had quite unexpectedly been quickly called away to beatitude by his Lord, I received the call to become his successor. After long consideration I accepted it and then served as Seminary Director in Addison for a little over twenty-five years, from March, 1880, until the Synod called me to St. Louis to Concordia College, where I have now served as Professor of Church History and Theological Encyclopedia since late 1905." This resume is signed, "St. Louis, January 24, 1913. E. A.
W. Krauß. " F. P.

From Synod. The Board of Directors of the General Synod (Board of Directors) was assembled in St. Louis on September 10. From the resolutions and recommendations we also share a few points in "Doctrine and Discipline". "The brethren in Western Canada have continued to confer with each other since the last Synod of Delegates on the question of the place of their college, and requested the Board now to make a decision in behalf of the Synod as soon as possible. After careful consideration it was decided to leave the institution in Edmonton. In addition, the authorities there were instructed to look for a puffing place and to take the preliminary steps for the necessary buildings. Since the Synod placed the further development of the institution in the hands of the Board of Directors, the latter had a fourth class, Tertia, established, but also immediately decided not to add another class until the next Synod, but to leave the decision as to whether and when the institution should become a full high school to the Synod itself. - Our brethren in Argentina are planning to establish a high school in their midst. The distance from places in Argentina where we have congregations to Porto Alegre is very far and the journey there inconvenient. Besides, Brazil and Argentina are two very different countries. In Brazil the national language is Portuguese, in Argentina it is Spanish. The brothers in Argentina would like to start work soon and are asking for financial support. The Board decided to advise not to start an institution in Argentina before the next Synod of Delegates.

but to submit the matter to the Synod." - Regarding the necessity of a synodal budget under our present circumstances, the Administrative Council has again expressed the following opinion: "Without such a budget, which indicates the needs of the individual funds, we can hardly carry on our work in a sensible manner. In the past, when we had only a few institutions and missions, it was fine for the congregations to collect for this and that fund, without taking other funds into consideration. Now, however, our work is so widespread, and the needs of the individual funds are so different, that the congregations can only do justice to all funds if the budget gives them an overview of the total work of our synod." - As was to be expected with the large collections for the building fund running into the millions, contributions to the regular funds of the Synod have taken somewhat of a back seat. The Board of Directors expresses the hope that the deficit will be covered by the end of the year, "especially as the good Lord has given rain from heaven and fruitful seasons. It has therefore confidently ventured to increase the budget for 1925 somewhat to meet the needs." With the ecclesiastical and financial condition in which God has placed us, surely it is not reduction but increase of the church budget that is in order. - From the "Nebraska District Messenger" we place here, from the report of the General President, D. F. Pfotenhauer, the following particulars of the total work of the Synod: "We have 15 teaching institutions, 2600 students, 150 professors, 61 institutional buildings, 63 professors' apartments. The value of our teaching institutions is $3,200,000. The last Synod of Delegates appropriated $3,800,000 for the Synodal building cafe. God the Lord made our hearts and hands willing, and in a few months about $5,000,000 was underwritten. About $2,000,000 is now in the hands of the treasurer. The new seminary in St. Louis is to be completed, God willing, in 1926. New buildings are also being listed at other teaching institutions. The young college in Edmonton, Can., is making excellent progress; it already has 50 students. A college is to be built in Texas. The institution at Porto Alegre, Brazil, will probably be able to supply our South American district with pastors in a few years. - The Inner Mission in North America is now our most important task. The good Lord has opened many doors for us. The mission in the countryside is now much more difficult than before. The people live very scattered. The automobile serves the mission well, but it also makes the mission more costly. For the mission in the cities, chapels are absolutely necessary if we want to bring the people under the sound of the Word. Therefore, the church building fund must be given special consideration. Over 4000 adults were confirmed in our synod last year. - A strong German immigration is now flowing into Canada. Our missionaries are taking care of these immigrants both physically and spiritually. In Mexico, too, German immigrants are very welcome; there, too, we have begun missionary work. -Our districts in Brazil and Argentina have a soul count of about 23,000; spiritual life is lifting up in the churches. In Argentina, many of our church members lead a nomadic life; they often have to move, because they can only use the land for

can lease. In Brazil the work is also done in Portuguese, in Argentina in Spanish. - The heathen mission in China and India is making blessed progress. A medical mission has been started in India by Dr. Döderlein. In Hankow, China, we now already have several congregations of Gentile Christians. - The terrible world war was in God's hand the means of opening many doors for us in Europe. In Zehlendorf, near Berlin, generous members of our synod have purchased a former rest home for $8000, now worth $300,000. In these buildings our brethren in Germany have established a seminary which will be attended by students from various European countries. Our synod loaned a professor, D. Mezger, to this seminary. Private individuals of our Synod are largely bearing the expenses of the Seminary. - Weekly and Sunday schools are to work hand in hand. Christian teachings are not to be dropped. We must not be content with Sunday schools. Only our literature should be used in the Sunday schools. Teachers in Sunday schools should be prepared for teaching. The Sunday school should not keep the children out of the worship service. It must always remain the handmaiden of the weekly school, and as such serve the weekly school." - Interesting news is available about individual events in Argentina. We read in the "Church Messenger" of our brethren in Argentina: "May 25, 1924, should not soon be forgotten by the Trinity congregation at Villa Iris, for on that day, as far as we know, the first Spanish speaker in the southern district of the Argentine mission field was confirmed. Although the answers to the examination questions were not understood by all present, yet our parishioners let many expressions of astonishment be heard at the fact that the answers were given so quickly and in such detail. The confirmand had been reading his Bible diligently for some time, and especially during the time of instruction when he was learning his Spanish catechism. This was also evident in his answers. Since the local pastor does not speak Spanish, Father H. M. Gehrt took over the confirmation. He also preached the Spanish sermon, which was heard by six Spanish-speaking women and one man, in addition to the congregation and the confirmand. May God grant that this seed of the gospel may take root in the hearts of the poor Spanish-speaking people and bear much fruit! May he also in the future remain with the confirmand with his grace, that the word of God, which he has now begun to learn, may become ever sweeter to him!" about the still small congregation in Bordenave - there are only nine families - it is not only reported that they attend the services diligently, but also that they decided and carried out a church building in the absence of the pastor without coaxing, encouraging and admonishing on his part. The church was consecrated on April 6. In their great joy over the built church, the congregation not only entertained all the guests present with a communal lunch, but also distributed "caramelos" and "masitas" to the children present. "The little church is built of the all-familiar "batzos," plain and simple. But we rejoice in it as in a magnificent church of hewn stones with marble columns and splendid ornaments. For it was

built up by dear Christians for the glory of the glorious name of our faithful God, that his word may be proclaimed loud and pure. And that is the main thing. May the faithful God continue to be with us with his grace and make this little church a place of blessing for many!"

F. P.

The 125th anniversary of the congregation in Conover, N. C. We read in ***Our Church Record:*** *"*The first Sunday in June brought joy and thanks- giving to the hearts of the members of St. John's Congregation. On this memorable day the 125th anniversary of the congregation was celebrated. St. John's was organized in the year 1799 by one of the early pioneer ministers of the Gospel, who risked all perils to bring the Gospel to the scattered population of North Carolina in the eighteenth century. All our Lutherans in this field were exceedingly glad to have an opportunity to hear Dr. W. H. T. Dau of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., deliver the jubilee sermon for this occasion. The text chosen by the speaker for this occasion was Heb. 13, 8: 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day and forever.' Dr. Dau was formerly pastor of St. John's and, incidentally, was serving the congregation when the hundredth anniversary was celebrated. The services were held in the church-building, which, sorry to say, was not nearly large enough to hold the gathering. "

F. P.

The Oldest Lutheran in the World? The *Lutheran Pioneer* reports, "It may be of interest to our readers to know that among its members Grace [of Concord, N. C.] has probably the oldest Lutheran in the whole world. This is James Spencer. During the War of 1812 he was a boy and hence is now 122 years old." But this is only something external. That the members of our Negro congregation in Concord, N. C., do not disgrace the Lutheran Church even in their walk, appears from the occasional remark of a prominent business man of that city: "If all Negroes resembled Lutheran Negroes, we would have nothing against them." There may be here from the *Lutheran Pioneer* some more

Details from the negro mission will be given. The newest mission field is in the State of Alabama. The work was begun here in 1916, and, according to the last report, numbers 1257 baptized members, to whom the testimony is issued "that they are living in the happy time of first love, and in several respects are reminiscent of the early days of the Christian Church." The examples given in the report confirm that this time of first love is a consequence and fruit of the unconfused preaching of the Gospel, the satiskaotio Obristi vioaria.

On the school fight again coming in Michigan. A St. Louis political paper, under the headline "Non-Catholics of Michigan Advocate Parochial and Private Schools," reports the following:-Detroit, Oct. 15. The Citizens' Committee in Defense of Educational Freedom, composed of non-Catholics, has now issued a statement opposing the proposed amendment to the State Constitution against parochial and private schools. It states, among other things: 'We regard the renewed attempt to destroy educational freedom in Michigan, despite the decisive defeat suffered by this deceitful amendment four years ago, as an inexcusable abuse of the privileges of initiative and referendum to which the voters are entitled. We look with suspicion on these recurrent attacks against the confessional right of minori-

would guarantee them freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom of schooling, and non-inhibition in the pursuit of earthly welfare. The proposed amendment, whereby all children in Michigan between the ages of seven and sixteen, below the ninth grade, shall be compelled to attend the public schools in the State of Michigan after August 1, 1925, is, apart from the confusion to be expected and the expense to the taxpayers which it would be likely to entail, a violation of the spirit of American institutions, and is inconsistent with the teachings of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Wilson. The proposed amendment does not intend to bring about compulsory education; for that already exists in Michigan. It does not intend to raise private education to a higher intellectual level by government supervision; for laws already exist for that purpose. It does not intend to compel all citizens without exception to support the public schools by taxation; for the public schools are already maintained by the whole citizenry. It is not an educational movement behind which educators stand; on the contrary, it is condemned by almost every eminent educator in the State. If this amendment were adopted, the already overcrowded schools would be assigned another 125,000 children who would have to fight for their seats. Now, Michigan's public schools already have thousands of children on half-time for a long time to come. Many children would have to stay home after August 1 next year. Of course, taxpayers will balk at the estimated $70 million cost of building new schools and the estimated nine million dollars a year cost of maintaining them. Why should Michigan seek to suppress competition in education and establish a tyrannical state monopoly therein? In such an atmosphere of intolerance no rights of a minority are safe. We condemn this revival of intolerance, encroachment upon parental rights, and the exercise of tyranny against minorities. The proposed school amendment is unchristian, unreasonable, and un-American, and every patriotic citizen will vote against it with a vigorous "No!""

Something for the visitors of movie theaters. A St. Louis newspaper publishes a letter from Vienna in which the following is found: "More than for the death in the House of Habsburg, other circles were again interested in the suicide committed in the spa town of Baden near Vienna by the film actress Eva May, who is also well known in America. The films in which she had played the leading roles had been shown all over the world and had been applauded everywhere. Now this young, beautiful actress shot herself. She had fallen apart with the world and with herself. She had been married three times; she had always separated from her husband because she thought that the choice she had made had not been the right one. And now she thought she had found the right one; she had a friend whom she wanted to marry. But this plan did not come to fruition. With the friend she had a little quarrel over a difference of opinion, and there she dropped the curtain, made the close of the last act of her life, and put a bullet through her head."

Tax-free church property in the United States. We read in a political paper: "The National Industrial Conference Board, a body created and maintained with the aid of big business, claims that property worth 55,000 million dollars is entirely exempt from taxation. These huge values increase the burden of the real taxpayers to a very considerable extent. About 60 per cent of this sum, some 34 billion, is invested in other bonds of the federal government, states, cities, etc., which are also exempt from taxation, i.e., in securities which, at least in theory, are just as accessible to the less fortunate as to the wealthy. In practice the matter is different, especially since these bonds are often denominated in amounts of at least $500 to $1000, amounts that only the wealthy are able to set aside. By and large, such tax-exempt securities are owned by banks, insurance companies, and other large corporations, as well as by very wealthy people, and usually remain in their hands for life. Of the remainder of the approximately $20,000 million in property that escapes taxation by law, the Commission calculates that about $1-1/2 billion is in endowments, grants, and other gifts to hospitals, educational institutions, churches and church-related enterprises, charities, etc., and about $1 billion is in scientific grants and special endowments. All the rest represents real property, land and buildings, belonging to the government, parishes, all sorts of institutions, cemeteries, etc., and, precisely because they are so owned, are exempt by law from taxation. How far all these exemptions from taxation are in harmony with the general principle that everything which enjoys the protection and care of the state should also, according to its property, contribute to the maintenance of the state and its functions, is one of the most disputed problems of political economy and administrative science. The least advanced and most general is the opposition to the exemption from taxation of federal, state, municipal, etc., bonds; but even with respect to these securities, so many objections to abolition, apparently worthy of consideration, have been raised that a bill to that effect failed to obtain the necessary consent in Congress for adoption. Even more serious reasons can be advanced in favor of the other exemptions, so that their abolition is not to be expected for some time to come. How to counteract the shifting of the tax burden to the shoulders of the less taxable, which is to a large extent caused by this, is the central point of the tax debates in Congress and of all bills which aim at an equal distribution of the tax burdens." F. P.

II. Decency.

In the "Ev.-Luth. Freikirche" we find the following summary of **how German heathen** missions have fared: "Since the war the German heathen mission has had to go through great hardships. It has lost large areas of work. Today, under the direct administration of German missionary societies, there are still 36 fields of work with 352 mission stations, 513 European missionaries, including the

female, and about 583,000 Gentile Christians. Non-German missionary societies care for and administer 34 fields of work which were formerly under German direction, with 316 stations and 231,000 Christians. - The following comparison of the income of the four largest German mission societies in the first three months shows how the depreciation of German money, especially in the last year, has affected missionary income: Basel, 1914: M. 310,700; 1923: M. 4200; Berlin, 1914: M. 236,800; 1923: M. 2700; Barmen, 1914: M. 153,000; 1923: M. 10, 100; Leipzig, 1914: M. 131,200; 1923: M. 1800. Due to the return of the fixed Mark currency, the missionary income also shows more favorable figures, although the former level has not yet been reached again. The exclusion of German missionaries from the colonies was a particular hardship for the German mission. The English have abolished this provision in their part, as the "Allg. Miss.-Nachr." writes: "The return of German missionary societies to British colonies, protectorates and mandate territories has been approved by the Colonial Secretary of State, thanks to the efforts of the British Missionary Committee. The German missions are thus once again on an equal footing with the missions of other countries with regard to the admission of their missionaries. The British Mission Board can now recommend German missions to the British Government for recognition, provided that agreements between the German missions, the administering missions and the native churches prevent friction when the German missionaries return. This permission does not yet apply to India. But no doubt the Indian Government will follow the London decision. Thus a great thing has been achieved for the German mission: it has regained its freedom of way in the British Empire, lost by the Versailles Dictate.'" To this we remark (L. u. W.): The "Allg. Miss.-Nachr." seems to take a somewhat too optimistic view of the situation. According to their own report, the British Missionary Protection Service can only recommend German missions to the English government for recognition under one "precondition". The condition is that "by agreements between the German missions, the administering missions, and the native churches, friction on the return of the German missionaries shall be prevented." The "condition" 'seems to be such a condition that it leaves the return of German missionaries in doubt at present. In this connection we are reminded of a report by Sir Arthur Yapp, an Englishman. The latter, as General Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. of England, and his report was to the effect that the expulsion of the German missionaries from India was not at all necessary. From this report, to which "L. u. W." already referred in the August number, we reinsert here the following words: "The sympathies of the German missionaries were naturally on the side of their own country during the great struggle, but in spite of all my inquiries I have not been able to ascertain unequivocally any outward act of revolt against the British Government, and so far as I have been able to ascertain the German missionaries as such have made no attempt to excite discontent among the Indian members of their Church. Missionaries, merchants, civil servants, Indian Christians, all concurred in this." we read further about the Hermannsburg Mission and the mission of the Hanover Free Church in the "Ev.

Luth. Freikirche": "On June 25th and 26th of this year the Hermannsburg Mission celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary. It now has in the Beth Shuan Mission 30 main stations (plus 1 Herero St.) with 26 missionaries, 4 native pastors, and 72,208 Gentile Christians; in the Zulu Mission 21 main stations with 19 missionaries, 4 native pastors, and 18,021 Gentile Christians. Until December 4, 1916, the Hermannsburg Mission in South Africa was headed by its first director, Egmont Harms, who resided there, with two superintendents in the Betschuan Mission and one in the Zulu Mission. When Harms then died, the Missionary Board at Hermannsburg elected the second director, D. Haccius, in 'his place as superintendent, but has not yet been able to find a suitable deputy, who, according to a resolution made in the time of conflict, should belong to the Free Church.' "The intended appointment of a General Superintendent in Harms' place has not yet been possible; but this will certainly be kept in view, and shall be carried out as soon as the situation there permits. For the time being the three Superintendents have taken over the spiritual leadership in South Africa as a Mission College. The Hermannsburg Mission has two seminaries in South Africa for the training of assistants, teachers, evangelists and pastors, one in Bethel for the Betschuan Mission and one in Ehlanzeni for the Zulu Mission. The Hermannsburg Mission lost its area of work among the Telugus in India during the war; it was taken over in 1920 by the friendly Lutheran Ohio Synod in America. This now has 10 stations there with 3066 Gentile Christians. The "Hermannsburg German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of South Africa," which grew out of the Hermannsburg Mission and is "fraternally but not organically connected" with it, now consists of 14 congregations in Natal and 3 in Transvaal, with a total of 14 pastors and about 3000 souls; 3 congregations are served by missionaries in a part-time capacity. (Miss.-Bl. der Hannov. Freik.) According to its annual report, the mission of the Hanover Free Church has so far collected about 8500 Christians from the heathen on its two fields among the Betschuans and Zulus on 9 stations. In the last year 129 Gentile baptisms took place. " F. P.

A testimony to the satisfactio vicaria from German teacher circles. We share the following from an article written by Rector Grünweller in the "Deutsche Lehrerzeitung": "Christianity is and remains the religion of the cross, the good news of the crucified and bodily risen God-Man, the shepherd and bishop of believing souls. Thus the Lord Himself testified to the purpose of His mission: "The Son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life for the redemption of many," Matt. 20:28. This was the focus of apostolic preaching when the Apostle Paul proclaimed: "He was given up for our sins, and was raised for our righteousness," Rom . 4:25; when the same apostle writes to the Corinthians, "But we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling-block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Greeks: but to them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, we preach Christ divine power and wisdom," 1 Cor. 1:23, 24. This is the gospel of which the apostle writes to the Galatians, "Even as we, or an angel from heaven, preach unto you a gospel differing from that which we have preached unto you.

let him be accursed! As we have said unto you, so say we again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. Gal. 1:8, 9. This is a fearfully serious word for all preachers and teachers of Christianity, behind which stands the authority of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, who was permitted to testify of himself, 'But I make known unto you, brethren, that the gospel which is preached of me is not of man: for I neither received it of man, nor learned it, but by the revelation of JEsu Christ,' Gal. 1:11, 12. What is the meaning of the human wisdom of modern theologians, who preach a "different" gospel, which is emptied of the godly mystery of the cross, which is not based on God's word, on the wonderful mystery of redemption and reconciliation on Golgotha, which even the angels longed to behold, but on the false light of human reason? The Apostle Peter reminds his readers in his first epistle that they had forgiveness of sins through the atonement at Calvary, and therefore peace with God. They had been made whole through the wounds of the Lamb of God, as the evangelist of the Old Covenant had once prophesied, and had been converted to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls. These are still the personal experiences of salvation of believing Christians today. Living Christians know, on the basis of their own painful and blessed experience, what sin and grace are. Through the thunders of Sinai leads the way to the glorious freedom of the children of God, from the Law to the Gospel, from Moses to Christ. So the apostles and the Reformers experienced and testified. So have I experienced it, so do all who know it testify, that they have passed from death unto life, not by their own reason and power, but by the free, sovereign grace of God in Christ JEsu. - The cross of Golgotha is the sign that is contradicted. It divides mankind, which comes in contact with it, into two great armies. In this struggle there can be no true neutrality according to the words of our Lord and Master: "He that is not with me is against me," Matth. 12:30. The school movement of our day is also divided by the cross of Golgotha. Those who have not yet grasped that it is ultimately a question of the cross of Golgotha, that the school struggle is a struggle between faith and unbelief, that it is a struggle between two worlds for the soul of our youth and our people, have no idea of the significance and scope of the school question. The opponents of the Christian school know this perfectly well. They see, as I know from varied experience, generally more sharply and more deeply than many of those who still habitually cling to the Christian school, but have no clear understanding of what is actually at stake, that it is a question of the glory of God, of the eternal salvation of our youth, of the future of our people. If they had grasped this clearly inwardly, then they would not be so lukewarm and sleepy, then they would not be content with half measures, but would stand up with full conviction and with all their strength for a school movement that is based on the foundation of the clear and full biblical gospel. After all, what good are Christian, evangelical schools that are only in name what they are supposed to be, but are not in harmony with the biblical gospel, with the eternity foundation of the church of Christ and the

Confessional Church of the Reformation have nothing to do with? The enemies of the cross of Christ know exactly what they want. It is reported that the publishing house "Freie weltliche Schule" (Free Secular School) and the Ausschutz zur Vorbereitung der Jugendweihe (Association for the Preparation of Youth Consecration) in Leipzig issue "religionless confirmation certificates" which bear a picture in which an older "comrade" points out two youthful children, a boy and a girl, to a lily-pure flower that is reaching up above the bursting cross that is sinking into the darkness. Here the hatred of the deniers of God against the religion of the cross clearly appears. This hatred is to be impressed upon the youthful souls by word and image. This is the deeper meaning of the "Youth Consecration," which is to supplant Confirmation. The task of Christian parents and teachers, on the other hand, cannot be in doubt. At the center of our Christian school movement, whether it be parent or teacher organizations, must be the cross of Golgotha. Only in this sign can and will we be victorious. We have one Lord and King, to whom all authority in heaven and on earth has been given, in whose name all the knees of those in heaven and on earth and under the earth must one day bow. This is our living hope, that we too will one day join in the choir of angels and the blessed in the new song in the glory of our great God in honor of the Lamb: '"Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast bought us to God with thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation,' Revelation 5:9." Against those who see the salvation of the German people in a return to Goethe, Rector Grünweller remarks: "We can certainly still learn a great deal from Goethe. But neither Goethe nor any other classicist can bring light and warmth to our poor people, but only the one who could say: 'I am the light of the world.' We think differently about Christianity and Germanness than Goethe did, in spite of some glorious sayings we find in this regard in Goethe's writings."

F. P.

Even some socialist leaders in Germany are **waving it off.** We read: "In the Socialist 'Glocke' Reichsminister (ret.) Sollmann writes: 'What is necessary for our party is more tolerance. We must address our demand that religion be a private matter not only to the State, but also to ourselves in the sense that we feel respect for every genuine religious experience.' . . . After all, each of the great religions seeks to overcome the ego and to guide man towards working for the whole. Valuable forces have been repelled by us or have not felt at home with us because many of us, from the apparent height of brittle materialistic freethinking, have scoffed at sentiments that rise from the depths of human longing and can never be satisfied by purely material progress. A new idealism must fill our party, a new sparkling spiritual superstructure must arise above the economic foundations of our party.' " To be sure, it is not true that "each of the great religions seeks to overcome the ego and to direct man toward working for the totality." The ego overcomes only one religion, namely, the Christian religion, which has its source of knowledge and norm in the Holy Scriptures. The Papist religion, for example, has the decidedly final purpose of making men submit to the ego.

of the Pope, not only in religious, but also in state relations. After all, it is something when Reichsminister (ret.) Sollmann seems to advocate religious freedom in the economically socialist state. F. P.

Radio in the Vatican. About this "Der Geisteskampf" reports: "As reported to the 'Schwäbischer Merkur' from Rome, the Pope has given his consent to a radio broadcasting station in the Vatican. He is said to intend to read masses and give blessings to the Catholic faithful by wireless means in the near future." Radio is like the printing press and other inventions. What should only serve the spreading of divine truth - for' to this the world still stands, Matth. 24, 14 - that also enters, under God's permission, into the service of lies and godlessness. If the pope should succeed in adding this radio to his means of seduction, it would be among the judgments by which God punishes the contempt of His gospel, 2 Thess. 2:12: "that they all might be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." F. P.

Monogamy in Turkey? It is reported from Constantinople that the parliamentary commission for the creation of the family statute has unanimously declared itself in favor of the principle of monogamy. It may only be broken if the first wife remains childless. In the Turkish press the respected writer Subki Nuri Bey takes a wistful farewell to the old Turkey with its rich, gigantic families in view of the coming innovation: "Today the old feudal life no longer takes place between konak [private house in the city], kiosk (summer house on the heights of the Bosphorus), falis [house on the seashore]. The large hordes of servants, the eunuchs, etc. disappear. A middle class is now beginning to form with a house and hearth. In the konaks, the family was separate. The women lived in the haremlik, the men in the selamik, but the children were left to the negligent care of the servants. All these customs have disappeared. The life of a Turkish family of to-day has no relation whatever to that of the old Sultanic days. The harem is dead. Life in tenements has modernized the Turk. This change springs purely from economic reasons. Since we have no more gold treasures, we can no longer make others work for us. The wars have ruined us, and we are left with only one option: to become producers, which we used to be consumers."

Secularization of monasteries in Russia. The following is reported from Moscow: "The Golovin nunnery, like so many other monasteries in Russia, has had to give up its buildings for the establishment of workers' homes and workshops. The secularization of the convent was preceded by a long struggle, as the abbess made the utmost efforts to preserve the convent for its former purpose. In the end, of course, the local workers won out, and at present only a small part of the convent house is left as accommodation for the 170 nuns; the convent as such has been abolished. There is no general provision here for the continued existence, or abolition, of convents."

On the "religious revival" in Russia. "The Spiritual Struggle" reports: "According to consistent reports, the Russian

Since the autumn of last year, a wave of religious fervour has been sweeping through the giant empire, seizing the rural population in particular and swelling ever stronger. 'Already at the beginning of the autumn,' writes a South Russian landowner, 'all the roads leading to the monasteries were thronged with crowds of fervent pilgrims, wandering again along the old familiar paths to the ancient holy places.' The anti-religious agitation was entirely ignored; the people merely listened mutely to the red zealots and went their ways. This behaviour of the pilgrims made such a deep impression on many peasant Communists that they declared once and for all that they would never again act as anti-religious. agitators.' A report from the north of the Empire gives a similar verdict: 'In the hut of the most depraved the eternal lamp burns before the image of the saint, the churches are crowded at every Mass, the monasteries have the greatest attendance, the popes are honoured as never before; nothing does the peasant begin without prayer, and tirelessly he beats the sign of the cross. It is an elemental movement, borne by repentance, by fear for the salvation of souls possibly wasted in terrible years.'" What a pity that these poor people are not offered the pure Gospel, and with it the way to true peace of soul and blessedness! F. P.

About Protestant missions in the Philippine Islands we read in the "Gemeindeblatt" of the Wisconsin Sister Synod: "In the month of May, various Protestant church communities, such as the Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, and others doing missionary work there, celebrated in all the larger cities of the Philippine Islands the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the first Protestant missions in these remote islands, then ceded by the Spaniards to the United States. Until then the Roman Catholic Church alone had the right to proselytize in these islands, and, as everywhere else where the Pope wields the sceptre, so in the Philippine Islands the peoples were not Christianized, but only Romanized; that is, they remained heathens, though they conformed to Roman Catholic ceremonies and customs. Now there are 750 Protestant churches and 1000 Sunday schools with 75,000 pupils. Over 600 indentured preachers are employed in the various mission fields. Last year about two million Bibles were sold or given away. There are two theological seminaries in Manila, one belonging to the Episcopalians, the other to the Presbyterians. The students are natives belonging to ten different tribes and speaking different languages. Thus the Protestant mission is spreading rapidly in the Philippine Islands, and great blessings are being bestowed, especially through the distribution of the Bible. On several occasions the Roman priests, wherever they ruled and were able to persuade the people to do so, burned the Protestant Bibles publicly and with terrible cursing of the Protestant missionary work. The Pope fears nothing more than the reading of the Holy Scriptures by the people, for where the Gospel is known, its pagan doctrine is known. Unfortunately, however, even the Protestant churches do not bring the truthful Gospel to the heathen, and the frightful unionism with which they are infested hinders the confession of the truth. But that they do bring the blessing of the open Bible to the heathen, we also will acknowledge with thanksgiving to God." F. P.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. November 1924. No. 11.

Defense speech against the accusation of insulting an ecclesiastical institution.

Delivered before the Criminal Chamber in Karlsruhe by E. A. W. Krauß, Lutheran pastor in Baden.*)

High Court!

The "Prosecution" alleges that I was guilty of the offence of insulting the institutions and customs of the Evangelical Protestant National Church within the meaning of § 166 of the Reich Criminal Code by the remarks I made publicly in my funeral oration of September 2, 1878 in Ellmendingen about a verse of the Uniate hymnal.

Before I proceed to the defense of the statements made, I would like to start with the remark that it might seem questionable whether a single verse of the Uniate hymnal can be considered as "use" of the Baden regional church. While there is no other hymnal in use than the one introduced by the ministerial decision of May 16, 1835, the General Synod of 1876, as can be seen from its printed "Verhandlungen" (Karlsruhe, Octavo, 1877), not only passed a very unfavorable verdict on this hymnal, but it was also expressly stated that the hymnal was not to be used by the church.

*) The wish has been expressed from several sides that we should, in memory of our recently deceased D. Krauß, reprint this defense speech held forty-five years ago and already communicated at that time in "Lehre und Wehre" (25, 257 ff.). We willingly comply with this wish. The speech is a masterpiece both in form and in its teaching and confessing content. At the same time we let follow here the remark with which D. Walther introduced this speech to the readers of "Lehre und Wehre" forty-five years ago. Walther wrote: "In communicating this curious 'defense speech' of our dear brother E. A. W. Krauß at Sperlhof near Wilferdingen, who some years ago was a pastor of our synod in Wisconsin, but followed the call of the separated Lutheran congregation at the place mentioned, we recall a note already given on page 183 of the present volume of this journal, and note the following. At

The book, which was published in the same year, states (Ströbe, p. 375) that of the 550 songs it contains, hardly more than one fifth have been used for public edification in church services as long as it has existed. The hymn which I have attacked, No. 434, cannot be counted among the chosen fifth which has really been used, if only because of its uncommonly low poetic value. I do not want to place so much emphasis on this; for even if the hymn in question has not been used de facto and is therefore wrongly counted among the "customs" of the national church, it could still be used de jure, both publicly and privately, since 1835. Also, if I had not presupposed at least the private domestic use of this hymn, for which the hymnal is supposed to be there, I would have refrained from a polemic against it at all, since, despite the pugnacity attributed to me by my theological opponents, nothing is further from my mind than to draw the blade against a sword that is already lying on the ground and is no longer held by any hand.

---

18 July was the so-called 'main hearing' before the criminal chamber in Karlsruhe. The plaintiff was the Protestant Oberkirchenrat. The public prosecutor to whom he brought his complaint is a Jew. At the trial, however, the prosecutor was a Catholic. At the outset, the latter expressed his displeasure that things would come to trial in this hall today about which the church was the right place to argue and the theologians the right persons. If the Protestant Oberkirchenrat still has something like a sense of shame, one would think that he must have turned red with shame at this declaration by a Catholic that he had handed over the solution of a theological question to the secular authorities and their physical power. As

P. Krauß had reached the part of his speech where he had asked the court to 'declare itself incompetent to decide the present case', when the public prosecutor, who during the speech had expressed his agreement with the principles presented by P. K. by continuous nodding, declared that he was unable to file a criminal complaint. So then the high court acquitted the accused of the charge and the costs, emphasizing in the first place in the reasons for the judgment that the accused's remarks on a hymn-book verse were unpunishable because Protestantism, to which the accused belonged, had the principle of free inquiry and expression of opinion. Thus this wretched scheme was for once of some use in the world - which D. K. would certainly never have dreamed of. With this the expected joy was also spoiled for the pietistically minded pastors; for they would have been only too happy to grant D. K. a few months in prison (one also spoke of banishment from the country); yes, in Söllingen the 'pietists' are said to have prayed for it (!). But God's grace heard the heartfelt prayers of the faithful Lutherans who rejoiced in their brave testimony. If the Saxon Lutheran Oberkonsistorium, which calls itself Lutheran, also learns of the outcome of the matter in the united Baden, the latter will congratulate itself on having found in its lawyers more compliant instruments for its persecution of the witnesses to the truth than the Baden Oberkirchenrat."

It is more important that at the aforementioned General Synod of 1876, Oberkirchenrath Dr. Mühlhäußer declared that he was reluctant to give a critique of the present hymnal, which, since everyone knew that Mühlhäußer would have wanted to judge the present hymnal not only from the aesthetic, but from the Christian point of view (if he had wanted to do so at all), was an admission that the present hymnal could not bear a critique from the Christian point of view. When Dr. Mühlhäußer calls upon his fellow synod members (p. 380), "the time has now come when one must provide for the religious life of the Protestant-Baden people in a thorough, complete manner by means of a really good hymnal," it is thereby admitted that the present hymnal is not a really good one, and that by no means is the religious life of the Baden Protestants sufficiently provided for by it. Experience confirms this, in that the conventicles within the Union, which believe they have the monopoly of religious life, in fact almost exclusively use Hiller's Schatzkästlein instead of the Landesgesangbuch. When Dr. Mühlhäußer praises God in that very place that the time in which the hymnal came into being is over, namely, the time when the barest rationalism led its undisputed regiment in Baden; when he further relates that a co-worker on the present hymnal has boasted of having cast the devil out of the hymnal forty times, when he (Dr. M.) expresses the certainly not unfounded assumption that this man would instead have brought four hundred devils of triviality into the presently used hymnal, then these are all extremely harsh, yet thoroughly just, judgments about the Landesgesangbuch. Even a Schenkel (p. 391), to whom "dogmatic bias" can only be attributed with great injustice, declared "that he never allows such songs of the Baden hymnal to be sung in the university service, which express religious thoughts in the form of an enlightened rationalism". When now finally at that General Synod of 1876, which I hope is still well remembered by the Protestant Oberkirchenrat suing me, the military senior pastor Sch. rund (p. 402) declared "the great majority" of the hymns to be "unusable", and Prelate Doll summed up "that all parties of the General Synod acknowledge the need for improvement of the present hymnal, then the Lutheran Oberkirchenrat cannot reasonably expect that a Lutheran, who in principle takes a stand against the Union - for otherwise he would not be a Lutheran - would show any special respect for this collection of mostly "unusable hymns". I could still refer to a far harsher criticism that the common hymnal has found public: in the "Studien der evangelisch-protestantischen

Geistlichen", edited by Dean Zittel, in the first quarterly of the year 1875 by the city pastor Eisenlohr in Gernsbach. There the Baden hymnal is reproached countless times for being even worse than the draft of the year '31; instead of praising divine grace, one often encounters in it a panegyric held in a screwed tone on one's own good conscience and the attained sanctification. Eisenlohr openly declares "war" on Kramer's songs. Self-praise is everywhere in this hymnal. Entire songs were distorted beyond recognition. He finally calls out to the congregations (who, of course, will hardly have heard him): "Thank your ministers, if they have been sensible, to let you sing only good songs, so that you may not know the unfit ones." "But why," he asks, "will ye carry the unfit ballast every time into the church? " If such a criticism of the whole book is allowed to be made in one's own church, it looks, I know not how, when the Lutheran Oberkirchenrat, against the attack of a Lutheran on a single verse of a song - for the first note of my funeral oration has not been attacked - immediately calls the public prosecutor to the rescue. In the former case, it seems, one must know all too well the academic character of such criticisms, while in the latter case one sees the seriousness.

But it is time for me to move from the criticisms that others have made of this hymnal publicly to what I have "publicly" said about a single verse of it. I have called this verse a "blasphemy of the merit of Christ," or, what amounts to the same thing, "blasphemous;" I have called it a "godless chant," a "hopeless hymn-verse," and have remarked that he who reads such things to a dying man does him "not a service to God, but to the devil.

Of all these expressions I cannot in conscience take back even one. I would do so if I could, for I do not consider myself to be the "perfect man" described by the apostle James, "not lacking in words, nor able to keep the whole body in check. But, as I have said, there is nothing to be taken back here. The strongest of the expressions used is evidently that according to which the verse is called "blasphemous." If this expression is justified, so are just with it the expressions "ungodly," "heilless." For what is "ungodly" is, however, also "hopeless," because according to Scripture salvation comes from God alone. But "blasphemous" is even more than "godless," in that the blasphemer is not content, like the godless, to ask nothing about God, but also does positive dishonor to the name of God. Thus it is, at least in theory; in practice, of course, it is hardly necessary to reverse the hand between the ungodly and the blasphemer. It is necessary, therefore, after this has been established,

as soon as the justification of the expression "blasphemous" is given, only what has been said about "performing a devil's service" by reading out such a song verse requires a brief further explanation.

Above all, I must emphasize here with great emphasis and ask you to consider that the biblical and ecclesiastical concept of blasphemy is far different from the legal concept. The reason for this is that God has a law that is incomparably stricter in its judgments and more profound (not even leaving thoughts free of duty) than even the strictest secular authorities. But God binds all Christians, especially his preachers, to judge according to his word and law.

When, in the first section of § 166 of the Imperial Penal Code, the state threatens with punishment only the one who "publicly blasphemes God in insulting utterances," it thereby recognizes that there is also such a kind of blasphemy which, even if it is done publicly, is not punished by the authorities because it is not connected with the secondary circumstance of the "insulting utterance. In view of the fact that the name of God is blasphemed innumerable times a day in the smallest village as well as in the great city, the exceedingly great rarity of suits brought for blasphemy is proof that § 166 is directed exclusively against such blasphemers in whom a frivolous, shameful sense - which no one who has heard my funeral oration will impute to me - gives vent to itself in frivolous, nefarious, offensive expressions. Gentlemen, according to biblical and ecclesiastical concepts, many things are blasphemy, and must therefore be called such in the church and in ecclesiastical speeches, which the State by no means regards and punishes as blasphemy; but the reproach of such blasphemy, so-called from the ecclesiastical point of view, is completely meaningless before the forum of the State. The State, therefore, has neither to punish the blasphemy itself, which it is merely according to ecclesiastical judgment, nor the reproach of the same. This will be seen in a moment, when we take a closer look at the biblical-ecclesiastical concept of blasphemy and apply it to a special case.

An extremely widespread work in the Protestant Church are the catechism sermons of Joh. Arnd, the author of the "True Christianity". Now Arnd, in one of these sermons (Frankfort a. M. 1719, Fol.-S. 254), answers the question, "What is the chief sin Against the second commandment?" "Blasphemy." What is blasphemy? "Taking God's name in vain to curse, swear, conjure, lie, and deceive, to false doctrine and heresy, and the like." Now no Bible scholar will be able to deny that according to Biblical concepts this answer is perfectly correct. Again, however, no man will deny that by far not all that is here

The same is true of all things that are called blasphemy, which are also regarded and punished as such by law. If, for example, common swearing, careless swearing on honor and blessedness in daily life, false doctrine and heresy were to be punished by the state as blasphemy, it is impossible to see how enough people could be found in the civil and military classes to serve as judges.

I further call your attention to the third verse of hymn No. 137 in the Baden Hymnal, which at any rate belongs to the select fifth really in use. There it says: "Jesus lives; whoever now despairs blasphemes Him and God's glory." Now neither a theologian nor a jurist will maintain that whoever anywhere publicly declares that he despairs of the grace of God and of his future blessedness is therefore to be punished by the state as a blasphemer, as he is called in the hymn (the state would thereby render the church the worst service). And let us suppose that Gellert were still alive, or that Pastor Eisenlohr were the author of this hymn, the public prosecutor would hardly stretch out his hand to him and say: "You take the liberty of calling such people blasphemers, who are not blasphemers at all according to our legal terms; your accusation of blasphemy is therefore punishable.

If it is already clear from what has been said so far that neither blasphemy itself, according to merely ecclesiastical judgment, nor the accusation of it, can be the object of criminal prosecution, this becomes still more evident if we convince ourselves by a glance at the confessional writings of the religious societies which are partly recognized and partly tolerated by the State, how exceedingly frequently one church accuses another of blasphemy.

I will not dwell long, gentlemen, on the fact that the Roman Church, in the resolutions and decrees of the Tridentine Council (canones et decreta Concilii Tridentini), which it has elevated to the status of a symbolic book, condemns, banishes, and curses almost all doctrines which the Protestant Church professes in contrast to the papist Church, and calls them blasphemous and dangerous to the soul, (the oath in question is contained precisely in the Christian Catechism for the Archbishopric of Freiburg), that furthermore, as a result of this, even to this day, hardly any Roman doctrine of faith in scholarly or popular form cum permissu superiorum can see the light of day in which those curses and condemnations against the Protestant Church are not found again. Rather, I will show from the confessional writings of my own, the Lutheran Church, that I have not gone beyond the measure of that in my judgment of the hymn verse which is called blasphemous,

which is most completely covered by the confession of the Lutheran Church tolerated in Baden.

The symbolic books of the Lutheran Church, the source, therefore, from which it can be discerned what a Lutheran minister should teach and confess, which are contained completely in the Book of Concord, first published in 1580, make their own the principle, often known in Luther's private writings and, as we heard earlier, also shared later by the mild Arnd, because it is biblical, that actually all false teaching is blasphemy. The Lutheran Church confesses (and even in your Uniate Baden Catechism you still find this remnant of Lutheran confession): "He that teacheth and liveth otherwise than the word of God teacheth, profanes"-or, which is the same thing, blasphemes-"among us the name of God." (Müller, p. 359.) In accordance with this principle, then, numerous individual false doctrines, both of the Roman Church and of the Reformed, are expressly designated as blasphemous in the Christian Book of Concord. Thus, in the Apology to the Augsburg Confession (Müller, p. 88), it is said of the Roman doctrine, "God must of necessity, that is, be guilty of giving grace to those who do good works," "that in it are comprehended and concealed many other harmful errors and terrible blasphemies against God." Further, ibid. (p. 207), the Roman doctrine, contrary to Scripture, that one obtains forgiveness of sins by following the statutes of men imposed by Rome, is called "a great error and blasphemy." Further, (Apology, p. 220) it is said of the Roman doctrine that one merits forgiveness of sins by works: "Therefore it is an abominable blasphemy to give the glory of Christ thus to our works of men." In the Schmalkaldic Articles (1537), written by D. Luther, the papal assertion "that the monastic vow is equal to baptism" is called a "blasphemy" (Müller, p. 325). Luther closes the treatise on the power and supremacy of the pope in the same symbolical book of our church, after exhorting all Christians (Müller, p. 336) "not to partake of the ungodly doctrine, blasphemy, and unreasonable rage of the pope," but to depart and flee from the pope and his members as from the kingdom of Antichrist-he closes, I say, this treatise with the words (Müller, p. 340), "But they that hold with the pope, and defend his doctrine and false worship, stain themselves with idolatry and blasphemous doctrine, and load upon themselves all the blood of the pious Christians whom the pope and his own persecute." Likewise, even in the last confessional document of the Lutheran Church, the Formula of Concord, various false doctrines of Reformed churches, e.g., "that God would not that all men should repent and believe the gospel," "that when God calls us to Himself, it is not His earnest that all should be

The Church of God calls the teachings that "men should come to him" "blasphemous and frightful erroneous teachings" (horrenda et blasphema dogmata) (Müller, p. 557), "by which Christians are deprived of all the consolation they have in the holy Gospel. It is also added there that for this very reason these teachings should not be tolerated in the church of God (on the other hand, it is by no means said that these blasphemous teachings should also not be tolerated in the state, and that their representatives and propagators should be punished by the authorities).

Now, in my funeral oration I not only asserted, but also gave proof that the doctrine contained in the impugned hymn verse, "God does not accept a late butte," is false and contrary to Holy Scripture. I have shown this by the example of the penitent sexton at Christ's right hand, who was indeed absolved of his sins by nothing but "a sigh in the last trouble," by nothing but "the desire to be justified before God's throne by the Saviour's death," and pronounced blessed by Christ in the words, "Verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with me in paradise." By this word that verse of song is judged contrary to Scripture in the eyes of every Christian.

I have therefore simply made use of the right given me in the Lutheran Confessional Writings to call false doctrine "blasphemous," by reproaching the hymn verse in question with being an ungodly chant, or hopeless, or, what is more than this to say, with being a blasphemy of the merit of Christ. While in Mathesius', Luther's friend, Postil (III, 135) it is said: "Whoever feels his repentance until the last hour, I do not call him to despair; for the thief came even just before the door was shut, though he came late. But it is just as miserable and dangerous when one only wants to start when his eyes are already broken and his tongue is already half frozen", the possibility of still becoming blessed is obviously denied in the attacked hymn verse to the one who in the last need still wants to turn to Christ, whom he had hitherto sought just as little as the thief. The reader of this verse must come to the conclusion that what is impossible to trust in the death of the Savior at the last hour, namely, to attain salvation, must be possible to man's own longstanding repentance. It is, however, to speak with the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, "an abominable blasphemy to give the glory of Christ thus to our works of man." Further: The attacked hymn verse must lead the sinner, who still finally wants to convert, to the thought that his sin can never be forgiven. The Lutheran confession, however, testifies (Müller, p. 184): "If any man hold," and of course still more, if any man teach, "that sins are not forgiven him, he punisheth God with a lie, which the

greatest blasphemy is." In addition to these two especially applicable passages from the symbolic books of my Lutheran church, I can also refer to Gellert's hymn verse (137:3), to which I have already referred, as proof that this verse <434:7) is really blasphemous, indeed that it becomes a cause and instruction for blasphemy, and which brightly contradicts the verse under attack. Gellert confesses, "Grace hath God promised, that the sinner may repent; God rejecteth not in Christ, that is my confidence," and he makes this confession without regard to whether this confidence is found in the sinner early or late. In n. 434 the sinner learns that God will no longer convert him, but will reject him for the sake of his late repentance. In n. 137 he is instructed to confidence, in n. 434 to despondency; and having arrived at this latter point, n. 137:3 pronounces sentence upon him: "He therefore that despiseth blasphemeth him and God's glory."

Now that I have demonstrated from Scripture, the symbolic books, and even from the Uniate hymnal itself that the expression "blasphemy" is justified for this hymn verse, I still have to remark on the performance of devil's service by reading this verse before a dying person. It is true that this expression has also been given its motivation in the funeral oration, in that it says there: "Otherwise, by such reading aloud, he will not render the dying person a service to God, but a service to the devil, and drive him to doubt or despair." I render a service of God to the dying man, if I hold before his eyes, with n. 137, 3, the grace of God offered in Christ JEsu to all poor sinners, and open to their end, and assure him that he will trust in this grace of God, believe, and thereby be saved. But if I say to a dying man, in the sense of the song verse under attack, "It is of no use to you now to sigh to God; if you had done so before! Now it is no longer of any use to you that you desire to be justified before God's throne through the death of Christ the Redeemer; it is now too late, the door of divine grace is now closed, and this grace no longer cleanses you from sin," then I drive him to despair and hinder him from taking hold of Jesus Christ in faith and thereby becoming blessed. But by hindering him in this way I am doing him a devil's service, since it is written of the devil in Luke 8:12 that he seeks to prevent people from believing and being saved.

Gentlemen, after I had taken pains throughout my funeral oration to show people how they should teach their sick to prepare themselves for a blessed end, you can by no means blame me if at the same time I thought it my duty to warn against that verse in particular which is absolutely unsuitable for preparing the sick and dying for a blessed end.

Who rather, as much as is in him, hinders such a thing. According to the Holy Scriptures, a preacher should not only be able to exhort by sound doctrine, but he should also punish those who contradict and oppose sound doctrine, 1 Tim. 3. But what could be more presumed than that the very songs about death and transience, among which that which is attacked is found, would be read to the dying by their relatives? Hence it was necessary to bear witness against them.

The expressions used by me in an ecclesiastical speech, and therefore meant - as a matter of course - in the biblical-ecclesiastical sense, do not, as is evident from what has been said so far, go beyond the measure of what is known and taught in the symbolic books of our Lutheran Church, which is "tolerated" by the State, and what every Lutheran church servant must be allowed to misconstrue, since, according to the preface to the symbolic books, he should not deviate from the content of the symbolic books either in rebus or in phrasibus, that is, neither in the matter itself nor in the manner of expression.

I now hardly believe that the high court will wish to pronounce a judgment as to whether the doctrine of Song 434, 7, which I have attacked, is false, and therefore, according to Biblical Lutheran judgment, "blasphemous," or else whether it is a correct one. "The State reserves to itself," says Spohn in his remarks on the Baden State Church Law (Karlsruhe 1869, p. 9), "no interference with or prohibition of the constitution or doctrine." If it is further said there that it is already difficult for the State to decide whether a doctrine is contrary to morality, "because the moral law is not summarized and promulgated in any norm recognized by the State, and because the State cannot subject the doctrine of a particular church or philosophical school to judgment as a standard," it is certainly still more difficult for the State and for a court of justice possibly composed of the confessors of the most diverse standards of faith to decide whether a doctrine is scriptural or not. Since, as I have shown, blasphemy, according to a mere ecclesiastical judgment, can no more be the object of criminal prosecution than the accusation of blasphemy, the high court in the present case is evidently in the same position in which, according to Apost. 18 the Roman governor Gallion was in Corinth. The Jews had listened with reluctance and blasphemy to the apostle Paul, who had testified to them, a religious community tolerated in the state, that JEsu was the Christian, and at last brought him before Gallion's judgment seat on the charge: "This one persuades men to serve God contrary to the law." By "the law," of course, they did not mean the law of the state, but their Mosaic religious law, tolerated by the state, and the institutions and customs resulting therefrom. Gallion was speaking at the time when Paul, of all people, was speaking out.

He said to the Jews, "My dear Jews, if it were an outrage or a mischief, I would hear you. But because it is a question of doctrine and of the words of the law among you, see for yourselves; I do not intend to be a judge of it." Hereupon he drove the plaintiffs from the judgment seat. If the high court were to enter into an inquiry as to whether the charge of blasphemy had been justly used here, it would be in the position of first determining, and indeed theologically determining, what was actually "ungodly" and "blasphemous". Of this he would have to give a theological definition, which he has neither the will nor the vocation to do, and with which he would hardly find general approval, since the separate churches already have their own, and indeed different, definitions of blasphemy.

In view of the fact, therefore, that we are dealing here with the accusation of blasphemy according to merely ecclesiastical judgment, which accusation cannot be prosecuted, in view further of the fact that, in order to decide the question whether this ecclesiastical accusation was justifiably made by me, a decision would be required in pure doctrinal matters, in which the State, according to the law of October 9, 1860, admittedly does not want to interfere. October 1860, I would like to ask the High Court in the first place to declare itself incompetent to decide the present matter, to dismiss the Protestant Oberkirchenrat with its accusation, and accordingly to dismiss me freely. (Conclusion follows.)

Luther's Brief Guide to Life for Preachers.

As a result of an oversight, Hoppe thinks, Walch included a small writing of Luther's twice in his edition of Luther's works, and the St. Louis edition, which is, after all, an improved and increased Walch, has followed Walch in this piece. It is Luther's little writing, "How Priests Should Lead Their Way of Life," which is found in the St. Louis edition both in Volume X, 1608, and in Volume XXIa, 166, but with all sorts of differences in the phrases. General attention has just been called to this writing of Luther's by a new translation of it, supplied by Leonhard Fendt from the Latin original in the Erlangen edition (II, 46 ff.). This new translation has been published by the Luther Society in the just published issue 3 (1924) of its "Mitteilungen".

This writing of Luther's does not belong to the class of his great, spiritually powerful doctrinal writings; compared with those main Reformation writings, it is relatively "light reading". But it bears

The book shows the Lutheran face: it drives the Scriptures and Christ, and since it deals with practical questions of life, it also shows the well-known common sense of Luther, beautifully ennobled and spiritualized by his heartfelt piety. In addition, it sheds interesting light on the circumstances of the time from which it was written. Current Luther researchers (?) both on the Protestant and especially on the Catholic side, who once again indulge in reflections about the morally degenerate Luther, should write these instructions of Luther to the priests of his time in their notebook.

Here now follows Fendt's new translation with some notes. If one of the readers wants to make exact comparisons, he should put the Latin original in Enders' correspondence (Erl. Ausg. II, 46) and the two passages given above in the St. Louis edition in front of him.

Life instruction for priests. 1)

Kapitel 1. The moderation of the priests)

Whatever the midday meal 3) may be, at any rate the evening meal must be sparse and short; that is good for body and soul. 4) Says also Horace: In the evening a short meal and a sleep by the brook in the grass, that gives pleasure. 5s) Also Ecclesiastes, 6) 31 (v. 24), means: A healthy sleep is in a moderate man; he sleeps until morning time, and his soul rejoices in him. 7) Therefore it is rightly said in a proverb: Merry evening feasts, sad morning hours. At last: Wends much chattering 8) and poculating breaketh down inwardly 9) and giveth a confused head, which in the morning is full of heaviness, slime, and stupidity. But these are terrible hindrances-

1) Ratio Vivendi Sacerdotum.

2) Victus temperatus; of course in eating and drinking, as the St. L. ed. specifies in both places.

3) St. L. ed. XXI a: "Breakfast." This is the prandium, which was taken at 9 a.m., while the coena. was at 5.

4) This part of the sentence not in Enders nor in the St. L. Ausg. XXI, but probably in vol. X. The translation here probably goes back from Erl., Opp. v. a. Ill, 385.

5) Epist., lib. I, 14, 34: Coena brevis juvat et prope rivum somnus in herba.

6) Sirach.

7) cum ipso, namely, the whole man is refreshed; in St. L. XXI "with the same" is misleading.

8) fabellae. Hoppe's translation in St. L. Ausg. XXI: "Schwänke" corresponds to the time.

9) destructum pectus. St. L. X: "ruins the chest"; XXI: spoiled stomach.

10) to pray, to worship (= to sacrifice).11) So that you may be vigilant here against such a chief evil,12) consider seriously that you cannot waste the evening without at the same time wasting the next morning and the whole of the following day almost or completely.13) Believe me, the experienced one! If thou believest not that which is experienced, thou shalt one day believe it by experience.

Kapitel 2. The study of priests.

In the evening you must at all events take to bed with you a passage from the Scriptures in your memory, with which, ruminating like a clean animal,14) you may gently fall asleep; but it should not be much, rather quite a little, but well thought out and understood; and when you get up in the morning you should find it like yesterday's legacy.15)) Likewise, in all thy study of the Scriptures, thou shalt utterly despair of thy understanding and thy strength, but with fear and humility ask of God for understanding. Therefore, when you sit down to read the Bible, first lift up your eyes and heart to Christ in the heavens, implore his mercy with a short sigh, and do this often while you are reading; say or think, for example: Grant, O Lord, that I may rightly understand this, and moreover that I may do it! But take heed with all thy might, that thou be not studious in the Scriptures merely because thou desirest to know and understand (for I do not think thee such a lowly scholar as to seek honour or gain or glory), nor even because thou desirest to teach others; thy intention must be sufficiently sure, for vanity may lurk here in the very inmost corner of the heart; but thou must want nothing at all but the honour of God, and must think so: "Behold, my dearest Lord JEsus, if this study be not for thy glory, I beseech thee, let me not understand even one syllable! But give me as much as seems good to thee for thy glory in me a sinner!"16)

Kapitel 3. The traffic.17)

Intercourse must also be infrequent and brief if it is to be beneficial to the priest. For that proverb is quite right: "Friends

10) officium.

11) sacrificandi is the term for holding a fair.

12) malum generalissimum. This was the general, gang and gäbe monks last er.

13) A commonplace that, mutatis mutandis, holds true at all times.

14) Deut. 14:6-8.

15) The old rule: Non multa, sed multum certainly applies to private prayer.

16) What noble, noble motives for the study of Scripture! But those who study theology in this way are rare birds in the scientific world and in general in a materialistic age.

17) familiaritas. St. L. Ausg.: "familiar" or "confidential intercourse".

steal your time." ^) If friends steal one's time, what do out-of-towners and strangers and lesser friends do? But in these things you will have to use the highest prudence, lest you avoid the company of men, and for this fall into the company of demons; 19) conversely, if you consort too much with men, be trampled under foot by swine. "20) Therefore, if God equips you (when it is necessary to serve, to counsel, to speak to your neighbor, whether for the sake of his salvation or because you are required to do so for some other compelling reason), no law, no rule, to whatever institution you may belong, may keep you from doing so. Every law must give way to love, even that of prayer and worship21) But where you are not called, do not force yourself on anyone, lest you want to win the world and suffer harm to your soul in the process.22) (Matth. 16, 26.)

Kapitel 4. Prayer.

Be mindful that you are a priest, that is, a minister of communion and publicity;23 and therefore pray not so much for yourself as for the sheep 24) with all devotion,25) especially also and preferably for the superiors of the Church, namely, the bishops and presidents; 26) for their salvation is the salvation of us all.

Kapitel 5. The service (= the sacrifice, so. of the mass].

You will not always feel fit to worship, but in order that you may become fit, you must sometimes attend the

18) Amici fures temporis. A parallel to this is Luther's gloss on the expression "evil time" in Eph. 5:16: "A Christian encounters so many obstacles and causes for neglecting useful business that he almost has to tear himself away like a prisoner and steal time at once, and perhaps also solve it expensively with disfavor, etc., as one says: Amici etc." (VIII, 1874.).

19) St. L. ed. in both places better, "into the company of evil spirits."

20) Here, however, wisdom is needed to always walk along from the golden middle road.

21) sacrificandi, as before. Consider, for the sake of the love of God and neighbor, Luther wants the keeping of the feast to be postponed or interrupted!

22) Also, much of the modern world conversion hoopla is a sign of, or leads to, spiritual bankruptcy on the part of those involved.

23) Better St. L. ed. in both places after the original, "a common and public servant," or "common and public servant of all."

24) Hoppe's substitution, "according to Weller," of omnibus for ovibus in this place (XXI a) is unintelligible; for ovibus gives the very best sense.

25) intente. St. L. Ausg. better: "inständig", "inständigst".

26) rectoribus. St. L. Ausg.: "governors", e.g. priors, abbots, etc. in the monasteries.

You can do this if you consider that you must worship for the innumerable needs of Christians, not for your own sake, but for the sake of others who are in sin. Therefore, what you would not do as a private person, do for those; and do not now and then begin to count on it that you may feel yourself qualified.28)

Chapter 6: Life in general.

As Tobias taught his son (4:20) to ask the Lord to guide his life, so do thou also despair of thyself, and ask him to direct thy steps according to his word (Ps. 119:133), as Jeremiah (10:23) saith, I know that it is not man that determineth his way, nor man his course, nor the direction of his steps.29) But above all, arm thyself with the highest mildness) against sinners. For this is necessary for a priest, that he despise no one; rather, consider his sins and miseries to be yours, as Christ (you see it) did for us.31) - Live well in the Lord, and if you want more, I will gladly comply with you if I am able.

So much for the Fendt translation, which only in a few places represents an advance on that of our St. Louis Luther edition. Now some more about the history of this inspiring little writing of Luther.

When did Luther write it? In the 10th volume of the St. Louis edition, according to Walch, 1519 is given as the year, and in the 21st volume, May 16 as the day on which Luther wrote down this instruction. Both is pure assumption. The fact that this instruction is treated as an appendix to Luther's letter to Spalatin of May 16, 1519, comes from the fact that Spalatin repeatedly asked Luther for a life instruction of this kind. This had already been done in the collection of Luther's letters organized by Aurifaber, which was then followed by the Jena and Walch editions. However, Walch seems to have had doubts whether this writing and the letter

27) That is, in spite of you not feeling skilful. The translation in the St. L. edition is better in XXIbut inverted in X: "so you must go to an incompetent".

28) Best St. L. XXI: "only do not begin to have confidence at times that you have seemed skillful"; but inaccurate is the translation in X. - Again, one must admire both the wisdom of Luther's counsel and the genuinely evangelical motives for an action which he inculcates.

29) St. L. Ausg. inserts Luther's later German translation here. But in XXI a the "because" and the insertion "(he speaks)" should be deleted.

30) St. L. ed. "Apply thyself with the utmost meekness"; "engage in the utmost meekness."

31) St. L. Ausg. better: "as thou standest, that Christ hath done unto us." Luther thinks of the substitution of Christ.

to Spalatin really belong together, and that may have been the reason why he also presents the writing separately. In his collection of Luther's writings, De Wette has proceeded in such a way that he prints the Lebensanweisung together with the letter to Spalatin and then expresses his doubts as to whether the two writings belong together. Löscher, in the "Vollst. Reformationsakten", Vol. Ill, p. 950, the Lebensanweisung completely separated from the letter to Spalatin, likewise Weller in the Chemnitz edition of his work: "Altes aus allen Teilen der Geschichte", II, 570. (Weller calls the writing "des seel. D. Lutheri kurze Pastoral-Instruction".) Neither the handwritten copy of the "Lebensanweisung" found in the Zwickau Council School Library and published by Buchwald, nor the copy found in the library of the Weimar pastor Johann Grau, according to Aurifaber's report, has a date attached to it.

The following reasons speak against the assumption that the "Lebensanweisung" was addressed to Spalatin in May 1519:

1. In this very letter Luther writes to his friend: "By the way, as for my describing the priestly way of life, why do you ask me to do this, since you have the apostle who speaks so abundantly about this matter in the letters to Titus and Timothy? (XV, 2447.) In view of this clear refusal, to append the "Life Instruction" to this Epistle after all, means as much as to assert that Luther had suddenly changed his mind before sending the Epistle. Possible; but -.

2. With good reason, Fendt points out that Luther consistently rejected requests from his friends for "instructions on life for clergymen." On December 18, 1519, he wrote, again to Spalatin: "The duties of a priest, about which you ask me, I do not know, since the more I think about them, the more I find nothing that I could write but ceremonial things; then I am very much moved by the Apostle Peter, who 1 Petr. 2, 5. 9, that we are all priests; likewise John in Revelation [chap. 5, 10], so that this kind of priesthood we are in seems not at all different from the laity except by the office by which the sacraments and the word are administered. All else is the same, if we take away the ceremonies and human statutes, and we must wonder greatly whence ordination should have received the name of a sacrament. Is not this then wonderful to thee? But verbally more, together with Philip, for we have often and sharply traded these things. - Therefore thy duty would differ in nothing from the common duties of the laity, with the exception of the burdens which the Roman court has laid upon all priests without distinction. But the greatest of all is that thou shouldest consider well to

Which place thou art called to, namely to the court [Spalatin was the elector's court preacher and secretary]. Like Esther, you are called to serve the laity, where you can, who are governed by this court. As this is the most difficult and dangerous, so do not doubt that it is the highest and first, incomparably more glorious than all that is yours, whether it be the horae canonicae or any duties which anyone may prescribe for you." (XXIa, 213 f.) This statement of Luther's shows quite clearly that his objections to the establishment of instructions for the life of priests and the like are rooted in the Gospel. Spalatin, the faithful friend, has not kept pace with Luther and does not recognize that a new time has dawned and, as Luther once put it, "our ministry has now become a different thing. To Bugenhagen, Luther wrote in late 1520 or early 1521: "You wrote that I would like to write for you a way of life. A true Christian has no need of moral precepts; for the spirit of faith guides him to do all that God wills and brotherly love requires. Read therefore this. [Luther enclosed his Tractatus de Libertate Christiana, "Of the Liberty of a Christian Man," with the significant dedicatory letter to Leo X.] Not all believe the Gospel. Faith is felt in the heart." (XXIa, 327.) Fendt correctly remarks: "Luther, in 1519, at no price wished to make it appear any longer as if a different ideal of life applied to the clergy than to the laity; yes, they have their own business, and the laity have a different business-but the spirit out of which clergy and laity do their business must be one and the same, the spirit of the Gospel. And a second reason is obvious: there were plenty of such life instructions for priests in Catholicism, and they were not bad at all; but they were commanded under canonical penalties (the episcopal and papal police were behind them)-is that real morality? An instruction on life from Luther's pen would have looked like a substitute for the canonical instructions, a Lutheran burden in place of the episcopal-papal burden. But the whole field was to be free to the Gospel." Very good.

3. In May 1519 Luther prepared for the Leipzig disputation. On the aforementioned May 16, he wrote once again to the stubborn Duke George for permission to participate in the disputation. His studies for this disputation had led him to strange discoveries about the papacy and its institutions, especially about the priesthood and monasticism. In addition, his interrogation before Cajetan at Augsburg in the autumn of the previous year had given him a deep insight into the Pope's doings. It is almost a psychological impossibility that Luther was able to write that "Life Instruction" in the spring of 1519: it is in contradiction to his

inner position. For the "Life Instruction" does show strong references to monastic being. Chapter 1 is tailored to a monastic agenda. The sacrifice of the Mass still appears as the main duty of the priest. In Chapter 4, there is the extremely reverent reference to the Church's superiors: "For their salvation is the salvation of us all."

Fourth, Luther had fifteen months earlier, on February 15, 1518, given Spalatin unhesitating advice about the proper inner constitution, the intentio, of the priest who celebrates Mass, and had thereby expressed thoughts which, on the whole, coincide with chapters 5 and 6 of the "Lebensanweisung. He writes: "I answer briefly: In every work one must always have the attitude of despair and confidence, namely, of despair because of you and your work, but of confidence because of God and his mercy. For thus saith the Spirit [Ps. 147:11]: 'The LORD is pleased with those who fear him, who hope in his goodness.' For fear is a kind of beginning of despair. And to speak plainly: as often as you want to sacrifice or do works, you must know and firmly believe without any doubt that your work cannot please God at all, no matter how good, great and laborious it may be, but is worthy of rejection. Therefore be thou first thy judge, and accuse thyself together with thy work as such a man, and confess it before God. This confession and accusation (for it comes from the fear of the divine judgment, before which no work can stand) will cause it to be pleasing; yea, not both the work and the accusation of it are pleasing to God, so that God has commanded us good works more to be a cause of such our accusation and fear of him, than that he should seek to be served with the same. Thus saith the Psalm [143:2], "Go not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight no living man is righteous." And in another place it is said [Prov. 18:17, Vulg.], "The righteous first accuseth himself." O an altogether long, unheard-of description of righteousness! What is justice? It is an indictment of oneself. What is a righteous man? One who accuses himself. How so? Because he forestalls the judgment of God, and condemns the very thing that God condemns, namely, himself. Therefore he is of one mind with God in all things, passes the same judgment, has the same will as God, and for that reason is true, just," etc. Further, "Therefore thou wilt do but so much in a right way of good works, as much as thou trusteth in the mercy of God, and despairest of thy works. For then you no longer work for your glory, but God works in you for his glory, because nothing is sought here but that his mercy may be glorified in us, not that we may blow ourselves out with our works against God. And this is the best, the only, and the conclu-

Nche intention (intentio) of all works." (XV, 2382.)32) Whoever was in the habit of responding so openly and in detail to his friend's moral questions, there was certainly no reason on May 16, 1519, for him to refuse the same friend the requested "instruction on life"-provided that the writing described here was that desired by Spalatin.

All circumstances point to a time before 1519. Recently, 1519 as the time of writing and Spalatin as the recipient of it is simply eliminated as impossible, and one talks of the period 1516 to 1518 as the probable time of writing. There is no compelling reason why this writing should not be placed at the same time as the 96 Theses, or even before them. Genuine, excellent evangelical thoughts can already be found in the letters from the year 1616, as the passages given in the 32nd footnote can prove.

But if Spalatin was not the recipient of this writing, who was? Well, it is safest here to confess our ignorance until, say, some researcher makes a new happy find. In the meantime, this thought of Fendt's undoubtedly deserves attention: "But the request for an evening instruction has a different face, if it was not made by a Spalatin or Bugenhagen, and not until 1519, but by an unknown, poor, oppressed priest in earlier years, who did not know his way around as soon as the instructions of the bishop and the pope had become annoying to him in their fullness and intent. To such a one Luther hardly merely held out the Gospel. To such a one he could write an instruction for life, not as a norm, but as an aid to find one's way out of the eternally old to the Gospel. Perhaps that unknown man spoke in the name of a whole circle of Catholic priests." This view is also in harmony with the seriousness which was peculiar to Luther as a monk, and which to some extent still accompanied him when he had already penetrated to evangelical knowledge. Thus, for example, his longer execution to Melanchthon during the Wartburg exile Wer explains the abandonment of monastic vows. Before he himself broke with the old commandments of men, he had long since been freed from them in his conscience by the Saviour's word of grace, and so he also kept those who were going about impudently and wildly, and in a validly evangelical way, as they thought, were throwing all the old orders overboard.

32) Fendt points to a number of similar counsels from this time, e.g., on the study of Holy Scripture, to Spalatin, XVIII, 1977 s.; on the righteousness of the crucified Christ to be applied to the sinner as the chief lesson to be learned from the Schrist, to the Augustinian Georg Spenlein in Memmingen, XXIa, 19; on the clemency of priests toward poor sinners, to Lang, XXIa, 46 f.On the honor of God as the goal of the priests' office, to Christoph Scheurl, XXIa, 60. Fendt also advises to read in the "Theologia Deutsch" ch. 19, 21, and 4, where quite similar thoughts are expressed as in the "Lebensanweisung".

to not put their consciences in distress. Only whom the Son sets free is truly free - this was Luther's ethical principle. And to those who live in this principle, however, no law is to be given.

The accusation has been made against the teaching of Luther and his faithful followers, and is still being made today, that ethics is neglected in their system of teaching. Before replying to this accusation, it is necessary to determine what the person in question understands by ethics and why he wants to have a special ethics taught. Otherwise, Lutheran doctrine is thoroughly ethical, and anyone who understands it otherwise does not understand it at all. The highest ethic, however, is the righteousness of faith by grace for the sake of the substitutionary work of Christ, which, according to Gal. 2:20, illuminates, floods, and permeates the whole life of a Christian man and, as Luther says, transforms us and gives us new life, so that we always stand in doing good, ergo also in doing right, and only have to wrestle with the flesh, which always moves into the unethical realm, in the power of the Spirit of Christ. Where this ethic is not practised, no special study of ethics is of the slightest use. But it is a peculiarity which may be observed again and again in the course of Church history, that as soon as men depart from free and full grace in Christ, they suddenly begin to become very ethical. Every Christian knows why. Dau.

Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago.

The recently appointed Cardinal Mundelein, in his organ *The New World* (1924, March 21), expressed himself thus: "Since Catholicity has come to be such a force in America, the charge has been made that the Church means to capture the country. This would seem to him the natural ambition of any religious body. With the exception of minor pacifist sects, this may be taken for granted by any zealous body of Christians. It is inherent in a staunch belief that the form of Christianity professed is the best, and indeed the only one. It is only when faith declines and zeal grows cold that any other attitude is possible. To recruit, to proselytize, to convert, are the qualities of any deep convictions. Surely it is the only defensible course for any organization that claims to be the Church founded by Jesus Christ. . . To say that the Catholic Church desires to have every human soul within its portals is perfectly true. Anything less would be a terrific comment on its professed belief."

To this we say: Suum cuique. The same claim is made in our country by the Greek Church, the Reformed communities and also the Lutheran Church, on the basis of state religious freedom.

And that is right from the point of view of the state. As Luther also inculcates, "Authority shall not hinder what anyone wants to teach and believe, be it gospel or lies. It is enough for them to wehrt sedition and discord." 1) Another question is who has the divine right of propaganda. God alone decides that through His Word, through the Holy Scriptures. God only wants to be, that is, God's, Word taught in the Christian Church. Scripture says, "If any man speak" - that is, in the Christian Church - "that he speak it as God's Word." All who do not stick to God's Word are strictly forbidden to propagate. Christians are not to adhere to them, but "depart from them," Rom . 16, 17. And the test on the ground of Holy Scripture the Roman Church does not pass with her doctrine, if only in regard to the central doctrine of Christianity, as we shall presently see. Admittedly, the Cardinal invokes "conviction." But the word is not an adequate designation when we look at his case. By "conviction" we usually mean one's own conviction, one's own, personal judgment. But own conviction, own, personal judgment, the cardinal must not have. As a member of the Roman Church, he is bound to understand Holy Scripture only according to the interpretation of "Holy Mother Church," that is, in concreto, according to the interpretation of "the Most Holy Father," the Pope. The Cardinal has no "deep convictions" nor any "convictions" at all. The renunciation of one's own convictions is very definitely prescribed in the Tridentine. (Decretum de Editione et Usu Sacrorum Librorum; ed. Smets, p. 15.) The Cardinal is a blank, "a blank," in regard to the question whether the teaching of his Church agrees with Holy Scripture. But Christians, who judge by God's command according to God's word, according to the word of the apostles and prophets, according to the Holy Scriptures (Matth. 7, 15; Rom . 16, 17; Eph. 2, 20), see clearly that the Roman church has already fallen away from Christianity in the main doctrine of Christianity, namely, in the doctrine of how a man obtains the forgiveness of his sins and blessedness. A Christian is convinced on the basis of Scripture that he is righteous before God and attains blessedness without works of his own, by trusting in God's mercy, which is earned for him through Christ's perfect merit. As the apostle Paul confesses in the name of all Christians Gal. 2:16: "We know that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ. So also we believe on Christ JEsum, that we may be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Likewise Rom . 3, 28; 4, 5. 6; 11, 6; Eph. 2, 8. 9; Gal. 5, 4. This central doctrine of Christianity is held by the Roman Church in the Tri-.

1) St. Louis edition of Luther's writings, vol. XVI, 50.

dentinum not only rejected, but also cursed. (Sessio VI, can. 11. 12.)

But Cardinal Mundelein writes even further: "But the charge [scil. that the Papal Church wants to conquer the country] is riveted by the blatant claim that victory for the Church would be the surrender of government to the Pope. The sole answer to this is found in the history of distinctly Catholic nations. Even if America were wholly and entirely Catholic, it would not lose a particle of its love for country and would possibly have as much jealousy, provided the need arose, to safeguard its rights and privileges as the most convinced Protestant land. The usual talk of the Church's capturing America is claptrap pure and simple and is a mere bait to catch bigoted gudgeons." These strong expressions, degenerating into raw scolding, are intended to express the Cardinal's indignation at the assertion that the Pope, and with him the Church, whose faith and life the Pope regulates, claim "surrender of government to the Pope." Now, since the supposition is excluded that the Cardinal is ignorant of the edicts of the Popes concerning the relation of the Papal Church to the State, there remains - tertium non datur - only the supposition that he is deliberately saying the opposite of the truth. Bonisacius VIII wrote to King Philip of France: "We do you to know that you are subject to Us in spiritual and *temporal* matters" (Scire te volumus, quod in spiritualibus et *temporalibus* nobis subes). To which, of course, the king replied somewhat ungallantly, "Let your very greatest foolishness know that in temporal things we are subject to no one" (Sciat maxima tua fatuitas, in temporalibus nos alicui non subesse). If Cardinal Mundelein wanted to counter that this letter of Bonisazius VIII. was only a private letter of exhortation to the King of France, that the Pope did not sit on his chair when it was written, that it did not come forth "ex cathedra," the objection is not valid, because the same Pope in the all-famous bull "Unam Sanctam" just as decidedly demands "the surrender of government to the Pope," albeit with an attempted Biblical justification, in the reading of which great demands are made on the preservation of seriousness. For in the Bull "Unam Sanctam" Boniface VIII says: "By evangelical sayings we are taught that there are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. For when the Apostles said: 'Behold, here are two swords' [Luk 22:38], namely, in the church, when the apostles were speaking, the Lord did not answer that this was too much, but that was enough. It is certain that he who denies that the sword of the world is in Peter's power, pays little heed to the word of the Lord, which is thus heard: 'Put up thy sword into the sheath.' Both swords, therefore, are in the power of the church, namely, the spiritual and the material. But the one is to be put into operation for the church, the other by the church. ... But it must be sword

be under the sword, and temporal power be subject to spiritual power" (Duos esse gladios, spiritualem videlicet et temporalem, evangelicis dictis instruimur. Nam dicentibus apostolis: Ecce gladii duo hie, in ecclesia sc., cum apostoli loquerentur, non respondit Dominus, nimis esse, sed satis. Certe qui in potestate Petri temporalem gladium esse negat, male verbum attendit Domini proferentis: Converte gladium tuum in vaginam. Uterque ergo est in potestate ecclesiae, spiritualis sc. gladius et materialis. Sed is quidem pro ecclesia, ille vero ab ecclesia exercendus. . . . Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio et temporalem potestatem spirituali subjici potestati). From this point of view also the papal legate Aleander demanded at the Diet of Worms in 1521 that Luther should not be heard at all. The secular power had only the duty to enforce the ban which the Pope had already pronounced on Luther. And Emperor Charles V complied with the Pope's demand and imposed on Luther the imperial ban championed by the papal legate Aleander.2) But it is not necessary to reach back into the past. In order to establish that the Papacy claims dominion in the state even in more recent and recent times, we need only refer to Leo XIII's encyclical "Immortale Dei" of November 1, 1885. This circular letter was addressed especially to the United States and was circulated throughout the country by the American-Roman newspapers, in St. Louis, for example, by the "Herald of the Faith," which devoted three numbers to the papal announcement. Leo XHI. uses somewhat different language at the end of the nineteenth century from that used by Boniface VIII. at the beginning of the fourteenth. He does not say, as Boniface did in his letter to Philip of France, that the temporal authorities are subject to the pope in spiritualibus et temporalibus. Nor does he say, as Boniface does in the bull "Unam Sanctam," that duos gladios, spiritualem videlicet et *temporalem, are* committed to the pope. But he says exactly the same thing in substance. Leo XIII rejects the separation of Church and State as an unwholesome order displeasing to God. He demands of all secular authorities that they declare the Papist religion to be the religion of the state, and that they protect and promote it as the only legitimate religion in the land. If they do not do so, they are guilty of a "crime." Other cults can only be temporarily tolerated. On the latter point it is literally said: "If the [Roman] Church declares it unlawful to attribute to the manifold kinds of religious practice the same right as to the true [Roman] religion, it does not for that reason condemn those authorities of the State which, for the attainment of a great good or for the prevention of a great evil, patiently endure it,

2) The Reichsacht is printed in Luther's Works, St. Louis edition^ vol. XV, 2274 ff.

That different cults exist in the State." Finally, in his circular letter "Given at Rome at St. Peter's, November 1, 1885," Leo XIII also exhorts all Catholics to "adhere with firm conviction to all that the Roman Pontiffs have commanded or will command," for the purpose of "introducing the wise doctrines and moral law of Christianity [meaning: the papacy] as the most salutary lifeblood into all the veins of the state." In particular, "the men of the press" are called upon to work towards the same goal: "If there be strife, let it be voluntarily forgotten; what has been done carelessly and unlawfully, let the guilty make amends by mutual love and especially by general obedience to the Apostolic See. "3)

We repeat: When the Cardinal of Chicago, in spite of these obvious facts, which cannot be unknown to him, writes: "The usual talk of the [Romish] Church's capturing America is claptrap pure and simple and a mere bait to catch bigoted gudgeons," he cannot have been far from intending to pull the wool over the eyes of an audience ignorant of the facts. F. P.

Literature.

Scripture and Confession. Theological Journal, published by the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church in Saxony, et al. St. Nos. 1 and 2. 5th year. Price: M. 4 annually ($1.00).

Prof. M. Willkomm, rector of the theological college in Berlin-Zehlendorf, writes in the preface: "External reasons forced us to discontinue the publication of this journal at the end of last year. In the economic situation at that time it was quite impossible to carry out the decision of our last year's synodal assembly that 'Scripture and Confession' should appear monthly from the beginning of 1924. If we are now bringing out another number in the hope of being able to publish it every two months from now on, it is primarily inner reasons that move us to do so. We are aware of this and praise the grace of God that our church possesses the treasure of right, beatific doctrine, the theology drawn from Scripture, from the pure well of Israel, and testified to by the church of the Reformation in its confessions. The fact that we possess this treasure brings with it the obligation for us to make use of it for ourselves and for others. This should continue to be done in this journal, as it has been in the past. But is not the actual organ of our Synod, the 'Ev.-Luth. Freikirche', sufficient for this purpose? Have we not always taken the view that theology is not a science in the common sense of the word? Do we not reject the distinction between 'congregational theology' and 'scientific theology'? Certainly'. We know from God's Word that all true Christians have the right knowledge of God, as well as the ability to speak of divine things, John 6:45; 1 John 2:13; 4:1; Colossians 3:16. But we know likewise from Scripture that there is a difference between the spiritual knowledge and efficiency which belongs to all Christians, and the teaching ability of the ministers of the church. We hold to this, in contrast to all enthusiasts,

3) Cf. the article "Die neueste Enzyklika des Papstes," L. u. W. 1886, p. 12 ff., where the main points of the papal circular are given.

that not just any Christian may administer the office of preaching in the church, but that only those may be called to this office who are able to teach others. We therefore also make it our business to thoroughly train the young people who want to enter the preaching ministry, and thank God that he has now given us the opportunity to do so in our own midst by providing us with our own theological training institute. We are also of the opinion that those who have to serve the church as theologians should continue to study in their office, so that they will not only be able to teach others, but also to shut the mouths of those who speak out against them. And it is precisely for this purpose that we wish to give them assistance in this paper. At the same time, the events and movements of the present church are to be placed in the light of the divine Word and judged by it. Even if we think of theologians as the primary readers of this publication, this does not mean that other Christians, both within and outside our circles, will not benefit from reading it. We hope and wish that quite a few will be found who will hold and read it. May God also bless this work of ours and this testimony of ours, that it may be for the advancement of His kingdom and the glory of His name!" We rejoice that our fellow believers and confessors feel able to continue to publish their theological journal. There was a time when, through our "Lehre und Wehre," we negotiated theological matters with theologians of Europe and especially of Germany. The situation has changed. For our part, we have not broken off intercourse inasmuch as we have thought it our duty to keep the readers of our theological journal informed of what is going on in the field of theology, not only of America, but of the whole world and especially of Germany. But the same manner has not been followed towards us. It is true that even in more recent theological textbooks we find direct and indirect references to the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod, but usually with the brief remark that with our adherence to the inspiration of Scripture as the infallible Word of God, and with our decided adherence to the substitutionary satisfaction of Christ, we hold a "scientifically overcome" position. We cannot close our minds to the fact that our periodicals, and especially our "Lehre und Wehre," are read little or not at all in the theological circles of Germany. Even those who are less harshly opposed to us believe that we cannot judge European and especially German ecclesiastical conditions correctly from our American standpoint. This objection cannot be raised against "Scripture and Confession," because it is published by our own people. F. P.

On the Origin of Biblical History Teaching in German Protestantism. By Dr. Fritz Seeseldt, pastor and principal of the elementary school at Dornseld in Galicia. Wartburg Publishing House, Chicago, Ill.
59 pages, stapled. 50 Cts.

This D. Reu's dissertation proves that from the very beginning the teaching of biblical history was not neglected in the Lutheran Church. It is directed against such common assertions as those of Zezschwitz: "In the elementary school [in the Reformation period] the catechism ruled exclusively, as in theology the dogmatic doctrine" and in Schmid's encyclopedia: "The merit of having founded the actual teaching of biblical history certainly belongs to the pietistic reaction". (P. 9.) On the other hand, Seeseldt shows that between 1525 and 1580 Biblical History had already been to an extensive extent an independent subject of instruction. "Biblical history instruction [for the New Testament] had another name in the early days of the Protestant Church; it was called pericope instruction." "Everywhere by 1580 pericope instruction, and with it biblical history instruction, has been introduced." (22.) Luther's "Pasfionale" Seeseldt calls the only truly biblical history book of the oldest Reformation period." Seeseldt believes himself justified in the judgment, "In extent, according to the latest curricula [in Berlin], Biblical history instruction is poorer than that in the sixteenth century." (22.) In what Seefeldt goes on to say about the aim of religious instruction, the relation of catechism and Biblical history, etc., we miss the clear, sound fundamental ideas. F. B.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From the Synod. On October 26, the groundbreaking ceremony for the new seminary buildings in St. Louis took place. Our synodical papers, especially the "Lutheran" and the *Lutheran Witness*, have already reported the details of the ceremony. The main content of all the speeches given was that in the new buildings the old, unchanged and unchanging Christian doctrine, as taught in God's infallible Word and witnessed to in the Confession of the Lutheran Church, should be taught by God's grace. From the German speech we take the following words: "We do not want to boast about ourselves and our deeds, but thank God for His rich blessings, especially for having graciously preserved His pure Word for us. We confess our unworthiness and ingratitude, our shortcomings and faults and sins. Christ himself taught us to pray: 'Thy kingdom come!' This petition especially includes this for us today: May He bring to our Concordia Seminary here, as to all our teaching institutions, many pious and gifted pupils and students, and send them into His great harvest as consecrated labourers filled with the Holy Spirit; may He always provide the Seminary with teachers and professors who are faithful to the Bible and faithful to the confession, who carry out their responsible office in peace and harmony, in one mind and spirit; May he give power and victory to the word which the graduates of this institution carry out into hearts, homes and churches, so that many may be led to the knowledge of their sins, to true repentance and faith in Jesus Christ and be saved. Yes, I am convinced that I speak not only in the name of the representatives of the twenty-eight districts of our Synod, but that I express the sentiments of the ten times one hundred thousand Christians of our Synod when I say: We all unite today before the throne of grace and ask from our heavenly Father his divine blessing upon this institution, that it may continue for decades and centuries - if it please him, to grant the world still so long a reprieve - may be and remain a rich source of blessing and a stronghold of the pure word and confession, and a means in his hand for the completion of the spiritual temple of the Church, which will one day be revealed and shine in all its full splendor and glory in the heavenly Jerusalem, whither all our longing and hope stands." - On September 8, our theological seminary was opened in Nagercoil, South India. Missionary Meinzen reports on this: "Fifteen years have already passed since the beginning of our promising work in the kingdom of Travancore [the southern part of our work area in India], and only now, after many a trial of patience, has it come so far that a small seminary for preachers could be started." The teachers are missionaries Theo. Gutknecht (director), R. W. Görß, and A. J. Lutz. The number of students who began their studies in September is seven. The curriculum is limited to the most necessary specialized studies, all by means of the Tamul language; besides, only English is prescribed. The course of instruction

is calculated to last three years. The reporter mentions "only seven students" who began their studies at Nagercoil, Southern Indiana. The "only seven" fit the seven boys with whom the college was opened in Perry County, Mo. by the Saxon immigrants in the fall of 1839. (Cf. Hochstetter, History of the Missouri Synod, p. 53.) The "very humble old teaching building, with three small rooms," at Nagercoil, also, judging from the picture, bears a striking resemblance to the log cabin of 1839 in the virgin forest of Perry County. But there is no reason why we should allow the theological seminary at Nagercoil to dwell long in the "old adobe building." The "mother church" in America has means enough to help the "daughter church" in South India to a doctrinal building suitable for its purpose and adapted to the climate of South India. We are fully convinced that "such an institution is an absolute necessity for the blessed continuance of our Tamul Mission Church." - In Argentina, too, God makes the hearts of individuals willing to greater gifts. The "Ev.-Luth. Kirchenbote" of Buenos Aires reports about a church building in Darragueira, which cost 5000 pesos: "How was it possible that this small and relatively poor congregation could undertake such a building? It happened like this: At the beginning of the year an aged couple, whom God had blessed with earthly goods, came to Darragueira. The hearts of these two Christians the Lord made willing to contribute abundantly to the building of the house of God. They gave the congregation two courtyards, and in addition they gave 2000 pesos for the building of the church." The same paper reports about another Spanish confirmation: "A young man named Augusto Rodriguez had been instructed by the undersigned [Fr. H. Jauck] in the truths of salvation of the Christian religion. This instruction, which extended over six weeks, was of great blessing to both pupil and teacher. What was to be admired was the deep understanding of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures which this young man, who had grown up without a Christian education, displayed in the lessons. His eagerness to learn was almost exemplary. Four years ago, a good friend had given him a Spanish Bible. And this Bible became for him the guide to God and to his Savior. Diligently he read his Bible. The Word of God did not remain without effect. The Holy Spirit awakened in his heart a desire to know more about the truths of salvation revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Therefore, he came and asked for instruction. This request was granted him with joy, and by the 8th of July he was so far advanced in the knowledge of Christian doctrine that he was able to make a good confession of his faith before a large crowd of hearers, and to be received into the Evangelical Lutheran Church as our brother in the Lord JEsu." F. P.

For the encouragement of our teachers and pastors who teach one-class schools. In the "Deutsche Lehrerzeitung" of October 25, Rector A. Grünweller writes: "Whether, by the way, in a two-class school 'the goals are never reached' as in an eight-class school, is a question that cannot be answered so lightly. In any case, the one- and few-class school has serious advantages from an educational point of view. And these schools can also do a great deal in the way of teaching, if they have efficient teachers and are particularly well equipped for the promotion of the children.

than the eight-grade school. Without capable teachers, however, even the many-class school cannot do what must rightly be required." In occasional conversations, teachers and pastors of our Synod, who had experience in teaching one-class schools, have testified to me quite the same thing. F. P.

Michigan and the School Legislature. The Associated Press soon after the election carried the news: "A decisive defeat was suffered by the propositions made in the States of Michigan and Washington that all school children should attend none but public schools."

The State of Oregon seems bent on creating new difficulties for itself by its legislation. After the state ran aground with its school legislation, we read of the result of the November 4 election: "Adopted, of the proposed amendments to the constitution, was one providing that all voters must be proficient in the English language, both spoken and written." What does that mean, for example, that all voters must also be proficient "in writing" English? With this it has its great difficulties, especially with the English-speaking portion of the population in this country, as experience amply proves. Some years ago the newspapers carried a report on the result of the examination of the young men who had enlisted to enter West Point. The report was to the effect that about fifty per cent of those enlisting had not spelled correctly even many of the most common English words. Why burden oneself with laws that can saddle the state with endless difficulties in the form of appeals? Luther is certainly right when he writes: Respublica, quanto paucioribus legibus administratur, tanto felicior est. (Commentarius ad Galatas, Erl. Ill, 481.) F. P.

To find the **heyday of the Christian Church in the** period of the Middle Ages is a thought familiar to the Pope and his subordinates. In Longman's, Green & Co.'s *Monthly List* for October is announced the appearance of a book wherein the song of the glory of the Middle Ages, sung a thousand times, is again played to the world. Hugh G. Benevot, O. S. B., B. A., is named as the author of the book. The bookseller's advertisement offers the following synopsis: "This book opens out to its readers a historical triptych portraying religious and civil governance in (1) the Age of Augustus, (2) the Age of Theodosius the Great, and (3) the Thirteenth Century. Part I shows paganism at its best. Part II describes the intermediary stage - semipagan and semi-Christian rule - from A. D. 350 to 395. Part III deals mainly with St. Louis of France, Henry III of England, and his successor, Edward I. In Part IV the conclusions are drawn that Christianity, becoming disunited, first through the Greek Schism and later at the Reformation, has not continued the healthy normal development it had on the whole till the thirteenth century." The fourth part is also perfectly in order. We need only assume that there is a "normal development" in Church and State only when both areas are taken into administration by the Pope through his decrees. Leo XIII also thus glorified the period of the Middle Ages in the encyclical *Immortale Dei* (November 1885). In this circular letter the Pope inculcated all states, especially also the Ver-

(Cf. L. and W., 1871, p. ff., article: "The Newest Encyclical"). (Cf. L. and W., 1871, p. ff., article: "The Newest Encyclical"). (Cf. L. u. W. 1886, p. 12 ff., the article: "The Pope's Latest Encyclical.") F. P.

II. Abroad.

Baptists in Argentina. The "Adviser" reports that at the end of 1923 the Baptist sect in Argentina numbered 39 congregations with 2349 members. According to the report, these congregations own 25 churches, have also leased 35 halls, and still hold their services in 28 vacant premises. They maintain 65 Sunday schools, which are attended by 2485 children and in which 247 teachers teach. 17 youth clubs are said to exist within the congregation, with an active membership of 489. The financial report says that the whole income of this sect during the last year amounted to 77,204.76 pesos m/n, of which $17,767.25 m/n came from the Missionary Society. (Evangelical Lutheran Church Messenger.)

Ecclesiastical "insight" into the schools, but not ecclesiastical "supervision" of them in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. In the "A. E. L. K." we read: "The "Ev.-Luth. Volksbl. (No. 19) reports the following about the church's inspection of the religious instruction of the school: After the abolition of school supervision by the clergy, the regional superintendent was provisionally granted the right to attend religious instruction, according to the following provisions: 'Notwithstanding the supervision by the school boards, the superintendents retain the right to attend religious instruction in order to convince themselves - if necessary also by asking their own questions - whether it is being given in accordance with the principles of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Requests to do so shall be addressed by the highest church authority to the Ministry of Education. If the superintendent wishes to attend the instruction in the schools, he shall give ten days' notice of this to the school board in charge, who shall be instructed to attend this visit.' These legal provisions have now been put into force for the duration, not without meeting with opposition from the left-wing parties of the Landtag and from the teachers, who wrongly sense in them the beginning of the return of ecclesiastical supervision of schools. And yet the law evidently avoids the word 'supervision' and cloaks the mere 'insight' in such a way that it cannot become 'supervision' at all." This worm-like course of instances (superintendent - school board - supreme church authority - Ministry of Education) seems to prove, however, that the left-wing parties of the Landtag and the teaching community "wrongly" smell the return of ecclesiastical school supervision. Experience shows that the "ecclesiastical" has the prospect of becoming more and more diluted towards the top. But worst of all, where does this "oversight" or "discernment" leave the local Lutheran pastor, who by divine right is entitled to oversight of the children who belong to his congregation? Here again the unnaturalness of the "Christian" national church and the national church "Christian" school comes out clearly. F. P.

The increase of students in the universities of Germany. It should have been expected that the pauperization of the academic professions in Germany during the inflationary period would have caused a great diminution in the influx of-.

The result should have been a push towards academic studies. So far, however, the expected decline in the number of students has not occurred. In the autumn of 1919 a total of 88,000 students were counted at German universities, but in 1923 there were still 84,728. This still represents a considerable increase over the pre-war figure of 61,000 university-goers. It should be noted that the number of women students increased from 5000 to 8591, and the number of foreign students from 6000 to 8000. The number of students at the German technical universities (including Gdansk) has risen from 12,232 to 27,766. The study of mechanical engineering and electrical engineering, as well as mining and mathematics, is particularly popular, while the number of professional architects has decreased.

(Apologist.)

"Theocentric" and "Anthropocentric" Religious Education. From the meeting of the "newly founded teachers' association in the Ev.-Luth. Landesschulverein für Sachsen" the "A. E. L. K." reports among other things: "After the noon meal, State Bishop D. Ihmels spoke on the 'theocentric character of religious instruction.' Theocentric religious instruction is not opposed to Christocentric religious instruction; we know that no one comes to the Father except through Christ. But the attempt at anthropocentric theology must be rejected." Very true! But because the regional bishop in his dogmatic writings rejects the Holy Christ as the only source and norm of theology, his theology is necessarily also "anthropocentric" in principle. Too bad!

F. P.

How the pompa diaboli of the Papal Church may be overcome. about this pompa, as it has taken place during this year, the "A. E. L. K."The pompa ecclesiae (the old Church left the pompa to another and spoke of a pompa diaboli), as it is popular in the Catholic Church, shows the following picture at the present time: Swiss Catholic Day in Basle: 'The march past of 25,000 Catholics with more than 700 banners and 80 music corps lasted an hour and a half; another 20,000 adorned with festive insignia were among the crowd forming a trellis. People of other faiths assured that they had never seen anything like it.' (Germania, August 11, 1924.) Eucharistic Congress in Amsterdam: 'The via triumphalis (Victory Road) was formed by the 25 km. long, about 100 m. wide North Sea Canal. ... . The spectacle that took place here on July 22nd certainly has no equal in the history of the world, etc. . Three hundred flagged and penned, mostly overloaded steamers received the Cardinal.' - 'When the Prince of the Church entered the stadium 50,000 people were gathered for the opening ceremony. Immense, never-ending cheering of the crowds.' (Germania, July 29, 1924.) "We are all still full of joy over the magnificent procession, in which over 380 associations with 365 flags and over 40,000 people were represented. (Germania, August 18, 1924.) - Ostmärkischer Katholikentag, Schneidemühl: 'At 3 o'clock the associations started the procession. One could count about a hundred flags. Incessantly feet stamped the ground, and unmissable masses of people surged past'. (Germania 7/8/24.)

In addition wreaths, cloths, colours. 'The purple robe of the Cardinal, the purple and whites of his retinue, the dark medieval costume of the honorable service, the blue-gray waters set in tumult by hundreds of propellers, the variegated colors of the banners, flags, and pennants-all together a picture of overwhelming beauty.' Does not all this give food for thought, and show evangelicals how not to do it?" We add: At the same time, "evangelicals" should be reminded of what they, as evangelicals who know the gospel, have to oppose this pompa. In the light of the Gospel, which so clearly teaches that we and all men have a gracious God and blessedness only through faith in Christ's substitutionary satisfaction, that Papist pompa is clearly and surely recognized as a pompa *diaboli*. Therefore, ye "evangelicals," come forward with the confession of the gospel! Thus you triumph over the pompa diaboli, first inwardly, which is the main thing, and then, if it be God's will, outwardly also, as happened in many places at the time of the Reformation. F. P.

Protestants of Holland and the Eucharistic Congress held in Amsterdam. On the occasion of this congress the Reformed State Party in Amsterdam sent the following proclamation to the Pope's legate, Cardinal van Rossum: "We sons of the Reformation, gathered in the Salvatorisaal, thank you for coming from Rome to our good city in order to tell our people quite clearly that you want to bring them back under the yoke of the Pope. We feel impelled to ask you to convey to your papal master, in the name of thousands of our people, the message that he should stop entrusting his ultramontane servants in this country with the destruction of Protestantism and abusing our constitutional freedom of faith, a freedom which is not granted to people of other faiths in papally ruled countries. We implore you not to continue to unleash religious warfare in our country as once happened in the days of Alba, the bloodthirsty servant of your predecessor. You will meet with stubborn resistance! May it appear that Protestantism has slumbered under the influence of a pernicious liberalism and revolutionism, your former confederates, your Roman bells will awaken it. May your presence help to awaken Protestant consciousness and love of our glorious history. God grant us that!" The Dutch, after all, have exercised more self-control towards the Eucharistic Congress than the English in London. Some years ago, when a parade through the streets of London was contemplated on occasion of the Congress held in London, the organizers of the parade were warned by the authorities against holding it, on the ground that they would scarcely be able to protect the parade-goers from the excitement of the people. The Eucharistic ministers consequently contented themselves in London with a "parade" in an enclosed courtyard.
F. P.

Complaint of a Catholic paper about "the de-Christianization of France". The "Germania" reports about the continuing deterioration of the in and for itself bleak ecclesiastical situation in France. From the turn to the

The Catholic Church, which was asserting itself in some intellectual circles, is not to be felt among the masses of the people. Attendance at Mass, even in the most ecclesiastical parishes of Paris, is out of all proportion to the size of the population, and "the farther one goes to the outlying districts, the more desolate becomes the sight. In the working-class districts one can already no longer take Sunday Mass as a distinguishing mark, still less Easter Communion, rather the number of children who receive First Holy Communion or are brought to baptism. In many parishes, according to the data, this is the minority, and the priest lives in their midst like the missionary in the midst of the pagans. And so it stands in a great number of the parishes of Paris and the other large cities. It is no better in the purely rural districts. In countless country parishes Sunday is taken up by work . . . profaned. The church is attended almost only by women, or stands altogether deserted. Many also remain closed because the lack of priests allows Mass only every two or three Sundays a month. A large part of the rural population falls into paganism or indifferentism. The situation is aggravated by the fact that the decline in numbers in the clerical professions is taking place even in those dioceses which some time ago were able to grant temporary clergy to their neighboring dioceses." (A. E. L. K.)

Lithuania. Lithuanian church orders in Memel unlawful. The Provincial Directorate in Memel had brought charges against the Superintendent Gregor before the Prosecutor for asking the clergy not to obey the orders of the Lithuanian Church Commissioner Gailus. The District Court declined to open the case because it did not consider the § 110 case of "disobedience of lawful orders." On appeal to the district court by the prosecuting attorney, the district court also refused to open the case, stating at length that both the orders of the church commissioner and the appointment of the commissioner in general constituted an unlawful interference with the self-government of the church.

(A. E. L. K.)

Census in Palestine. The "A. E. L. K." reports: "The results of the English census in Palestine of October 3, 1922, the first modern census available from that country, have recently been released to the public. According to these, Palestine has 757, 181 inhabitants, of whom 598,339 are Mohammedans, 83,957 Jews, 73,024 Christians, 1862 Hindus and Sihks. The Mohammedans again break up into four denominations, of which that of the Sunnis, with 590,890 souls, forms by far the majority. The Christians break up into no less than 15 denominations. Nearly half, 33,369, are Greek Orthodox, 14,245 Roman Catholic, and 11, 191 Greek Catholic (Uniate). After these the Sunnis constitute 78 per cent, the Jews 11 per cent, the Christians not quite 10 per cent, of the population, while not much more than 1 per cent is accounted for by the other Mohammedan and the two Indian denominations. The three largest cities are: Jerusalem with 62,578, Jaffa with 47,709, Haifa with 24,634 inhabitants. In Jerusalem there were 33,971 Jews to 14,699 Christians and 13,411 Mohammedans.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 70. December 1924. No. 12.

The world and human deception by the upcoming papal jubilee.

Pope Pius XI, who at present sits on the "Holy See", has proclaimed a Jubilee Year by a Bull of 31 May of this year. It is to begin with the first Vespers at Christmas of this year and conclude with the Christmas Vespers of 1925. All the faithful of Christ are invited to Rome. The Pope expects that primo loco a large crowd from all Catholic nations will accept the invitation to Rome, to the "second fatherland of all Catholic nations". But his longing extends even further. He also wants to welcome in Rome in the Jubilee year those whom a "centuries-long unholy" separation from the Papal Church keeps away. He asserts that nothing "more pleasant and consoling" could happen to him than to see many of the apostates, though not all, return to the flock that he, the pope, shepherds. He also has "really some hope" that this might happen. To encourage waverers, he promises to lovingly embrace all who will turn back to Rome on the occasion of this great Jubilee and to welcome them into the number of his most faithful sons. All Jubilee pilgrims will be granted plenary indulgence, remission and pardon of their sins for the course of the Jubilee year, if they receive the Holy Sacraments of the Altar on ten days and visit the prescribed principal churches in Rome. This Jubilee Year, and what belongs to it, Pius XI thinks he can organize "in the authority of Almighty God, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and of Our [the Pope's] own" authority.

The Jubilee has a history. The first ordinance of the Jubilee was by Boniface VIII, the same pope who wrote to King Philip of France, "We do thee to know that thou art subject to Us in spiritual and temporal things," and to whom the king replied, "Let thy greatest foolishness (fatuitas) know that we are subject to no one in temporal things." Boniface VIII. sestly appointed that the jubilee year should be celebrated every hundred years.

should be celebrated. Clement VI reduced the time to fifty years, Urban VI to thirty-three years, Paul II to twenty-five years. As reason for the shortening of time "the shortness of human life" is given. But that also financial interests were by no means only in the background was generally known and also admitted. The "Jubilee Year" or "Holy Year" turned out to be a "golden" year in the material sense of the word. Secular princes and also individual ecclesiastical dignitaries described the trade in indulgences in general, and the Jubilee years in particular, as a robbery and plundering of the peoples. Kolde 1) summarizes the ceremonial of the opening of the Jubilee Year according to Roman documents as follows: "On the eve of Christmas, the Pope solemnly opens the Holy Door. For this purpose he lets himself be carried in full regalia, the triple crown on his head, a gilded candle in his hand, in front of the walled gate in the vestibule of St. Peter's church. From here he first sends three cardinals as his legates to perform the same ceremonies at the three other principal churches [of Rome], St. Paul, St. John of Lateran, and Sta. Maria Maggiore. After the singers of the papal chapel have sung the psalm Iubilate Deo, omnis terra, the pope strikes with a hammer (originally quite ordinary, now richly gilded) the masonry prepared from within to collapse, and, after the door has been completely torn down from within by workmen, is the first to step through the door of grace, which then remains open throughout the year until it is closed again under appropriate ceremonies, guarded day and night by priests."

Christians know what to make of this papal jubilee. In the course of the coming year we shall have occasion to discuss several more details of the Anno Santo. Here, for the present, let us point out a few main points which show this papal institution to be quite a shameless fraud. Luther had Clement VII's Jubilee Bull of 1524 printed at the beginning of 1524 2) and added a preface and several notes. In the preface Luther says, among other things, that the Jubilee Bull clearly proves that the Pope has forgotten how to be ashamed. He poses "as if his stuff were still valid, and the Gospel had never been preached. That means, I think, that he has taken off his little cap of shame and can no longer blush.

Based on Scripture, what about the forgiveness of sins? The Scripture teaches, then, that every man needs the forgiveness of sins.

1) RE.3 IX, 549.
2) Also printed in the St. Louis edition of Luther's works, vol. XIX, 766 ff. In the Erlanger Ausg. vol. 29, 298 ff.

Forgiveness of sins, for there is none righteous before God, not even one. They have all gone astray and have all become unrighteous, Rom . 3, 10 ff. Scripture further teaches that for every man, not one excepted, there is full forgiveness of his sins in God's heart through Christ's satisfactio vicaria; for "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and imputing not their sins unto them"-to all men. This reconciliation of the whole world of sinners to Himself God accomplished nearly 1900 years ago by the satisfactio Christi vicaria, that is, by placing Christ, His incarnate Son, in the place of men, both under the obligation (Gal. 4:4, 5) and the penalty (Gal. 3:13) of His law given to men. Scripture further teaches that God does not keep to Himself the perfect forgiveness of sins present in His heart through Christ's substitutionary satisfaction, but causes it to be proclaimed throughout the world. The apostle Paul adds to his account of the atonement made through Christ the words, "And hath established among us the word of reconciliation," 2 Cor. 5:19. With the proclamation of this atonement made through Christ, that is, with the gospel, the Christian church is to go into all the world. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark. 16:15. Finally, Scripture also teaches that on the part of man there is no other means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins than by faith in the forgiveness which Christ, as the only Mediator between God and man, has purchased by his vicarious satisfaction for all men, and which he has caused to be preached in the world, that it may be believed by men, and thereby become the personal possession of men. "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, even the man Christ JEsus, who gave himself for all to be redeemed, that these things might be preached in his time," 1 Tim. 2:5, 6. All works on the part of man are here purely excluded. The apostle Paul describes the faith of all Christians in all times and places until the last day thus: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, we also believe in Jesus Christ, that we may be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified," Galatians 2:16. 2:16; so purely are all works on the part of man excluded, that the apostle warns, "Ye have lost Christ, who would be justified by the law, and are fallen from grace," Gal. 5:4.

Among the works excluded as a means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins is maturing, whether the maturing be to Jerusalem or to Rome or to any other place.

of the world. As the worship of the New Testament is not bound to a certain place (Joh. 4, 21-24), so also the forgiveness of sins. Christ has placed the forgiveness of sins which He purchased in the gospel to be preached in all the world, and he who believes the gospel has the forgiveness of sins. As near as the word of the gospel is to us men, so near is the forgiveness of sins purchased by Christ. And in what place and time we believe the gospel, we have the forgiveness of our sins without any change of place. This the Scriptures very emphatically inculcate. Of all who have come to believe the gospel anywhere in the world, it is said in Heb. 12:22ff. that they have thereby come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God. There is no thought of a change of place. Yes, the scripture explicitly warns against thoughts of travel, e.g. Rom . 10:6 ff. where the righteousness of the law is contrasted with the righteousness of faith, and thus addresses man, "Say not in thine heart, Who shall go up to heaven? (which is nothing else than bringing Christ down) or, Who will go down into the deep? (which is nothing else, but to bring Christ from the dead). But what does it say? The w o r t is near thee, namely, in thy mouth and in thy heart. This is the word of faith which we preach." Here it is clearly expressed that every man has forgiveness of sins or righteousness as near as the word of the gospel is to him. If any man has a word of the gospel in his mouth, e.g., the word, "The blood of JEsu Christ, the Son of God, maketh us clean from all sin," therewith in his mouth is the forgiveness of sins, and if he believes the word, he is in personal possession of the forgiveness of sins. If any man be moved in his heart with a word of the gospel, e.g., the word, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," by that word of the gospel the forgiveness of sins is as near to him as his heart; and if he believe the word, he is in personal possession of the forgiveness of sins. Admittedly, the forgiveness of sins had to come from heaven, and be brought up from the deep. But this does not need to happen first; it has already happened. The Son of God came down from heaven by His incarnation, nor did He refuse to descend into the depths, into death and the grave. But with this Christ has now also brought about for men the forgiveness of sins, and then put it into the word of the gospel, that it might be believed by man and appropriated by faith. Now he who, like the popes, sends men on journeys to obtain the forgiveness of sins, instead of referring them to the faith of the gospel, makes

The world- and man-deception of the papal jubilee. 357 actually draws a great line through the whole redemptive work of Christ. It leads men not to Christ, but away from Christ. In the papal camp, for the introduction of "jubilee years," reference has been made to Deut. 25:10, where it is said, "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and shall call it a year of remission in the land." But from the words of Christ Luk 4:19 ("to preach the acceptable year of the Lord") we see that not merely the hundredth or the fiftieth or the thirty-third or the twenty-fifth year, but the whole period of the New Testament, every year, every day and every hour, is a great year of remission and rejoicing, whenever and wherever the gospel of the forgiveness of sins purchased by Christ is preached.

According to this, the papal jubilees, including the one proclaimed by the present pope, are to be judged. The papal jubilee, which ties the forgiveness of sins to a certain place and time, to traveling to Rome in the jubilee year, clearly and palpably reveals the fact that the alleged followers of Peter have completely fallen away from Christian teaching. It is quite possible that a large crowd of people will accept the papal invitation to Rome. It is also possible, therefore, that the railroads and the shipping companies will do an excellent business in the coming year. But it is not only possible, but quite certain, that all who go to Rome to obtain the forgiveness of sins will pass by the forgiveness of sins. Suppose, for the sake of God's grace, someone were to travel around the world all his life, he would spend his whole life traveling out of the way of the forgiveness of sins. Reason: forgiveness of sins is not obtained through travel, but only through faith in the gospel.

For the announcement of the Rome journey, the present Pope, like his predecessors, invokes the authority of "the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul". But both apostles very clearly disallowed this invocation of their authority from the outset. Both apostles teach very firmly that men in all places and at all times obtain forgiveness of sins and blessedness only through faith in the name of the Savior crucified for the sins of the world. Peter testified to the high council at Jerusalem: "There is salvation in no other, neither is there any other name given unto men, whereby we must be saved. 4:12. And in the house of Cornelius he adds, that not only he and the apostles of the New Testament, but also all the prophets of the Old Testament teach the same thing concerning the forgiveness of sins, "Of this [Jesus] all the prophets testify, that through his name all that believe on him should receive remission of sins," Acts 10:43. 10:43. There is no hint of a reference to a hundredth or fiftieth commandment.

twentieth or any intervening year of jubilee, and no reference to a journey to Jerusalem or to Rome or to any other place in the world for the purpose of obtaining the forgiveness of sins: Sins. Likewise, this reference is entirely absent from the Apostle Paul. We already see that Paul, as he opposes all works of men for the forgiveness of sins, so also in particular all thoughts of travel, when he writes: "The word is near thee, that is, in thy mouth and in thy heart. This is the word of faith which we preach," Rom . 10, 8. If we think now of the ceremonial of the opening of the Jubilee in Rome, it is certain: Even if the Pope, in full regalia, with the triple crown on his head and the gilded candle in his hand, steps before the gate, which has been walled up since the last Jubilee, opens the gate and is the first to pass through it, he stands before the gate as an unpardoned sinner, and after passing through it he is still an unpardoned sinner, because the entrance into Christ's kingdom of grace here on earth does not take place through the "golden gate" in Rome, but only through faith in Christ, that is, through faith in the forgiveness of sins acquired through Christ alone. And the whole multitude of pilgrims who, after the pope has gone before them, pass through the gate, thinking thereby to obtain the forgiveness of their sins, are poor deceived people. They pass solemnly by the pardon of sins, and go to everlasting destruction, unless they yet get away from their delusion, and follow Christ's direction, "Repent, and believe the gospel." Mark. 1, 15.

How can it be explained that the lie of the papist jubilee, which so obviously denies the whole of Christianity, is believed in the world? The explanation is given in 2 Thess. 2,3-12, where the apostle Paul describes the great apostasy within the Christian church, namely, the apostasy that takes place through the appearance of the abominable one, who exalts himself above all that is called God or worship, that is, that he sits down in the temple of God as a god and pretends to be God, who succeeds in the world "according to the working of Satan with all kinds of lying powers and signs and wonders. Those are deceived by him out of God's judgment who have not accepted the love of the saving truth, that is, the gospel of the Saviour crucified for the sins of the world. Literally, 2 Thess. 2:11, 12: "Therefore [because they have not received the love of the truth, that they might be saved] God will send them strong errors, that they may believe a lie; that they all may be judged who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness."

Why does the Pope, especially in our time, have the courage to confront the Church and the world with the deception of the Jubilee Year, which is so obvious?

How can we add to this, since the antichristic abomination of the papacy in general and of a papist Jubilee in particular was so powerfully exposed by Luther at the time of the Reformation? We are not mistaken when we say that in the papist camp it is thought that Luther's testimony of the attainment of the forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ's satisfactio vicaria has been sufficiently forgotten in our time. Dr. Joseph Pohle, in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*[3]), thus comforts Papist hearts in the present day: "The strict orthodoxy of the Old Lutherans, e. *g.*, in the kingdom of Saxony [the Saxon Free Church is meant] and the State of Missouri [the Missouri Synod is meant], alone continues to cling tenaciously to a system [the Christian doctrine of justification is meant] which otherwise would have slowly fallen into oblivion." This description of the state of affairs requires a few remarks: 1. the "strict orthodoxy" of the church of the Reformation is advocated not only by the Lutheran Free Church of Saxony and St. Paul and the Missouri Synod, but also by a considerable number of faithful followers of the faith and the confession, albeit outside their narrower ecclesiastical organization. 2. (2) However, most of the theological professors, who are pretty generally regarded as representatives of Protestantism, have fallen away from the Christian doctrine of justification. This is because they have fallen for the Pope's "theological" method. As the Pope draws and regulates Christian doctrine from his own papal interior, from his "pious" scrinium pectoris, so modern Protestant professors have drawn back upon their "pious self-consciousness," upon their "Christian experience," in order to draw and regulate Christian doctrine from thence. And the Pope has certainly no right to reproach the Protestant professors from this. For what is right for the Pope is cheap for the Protestant professors. But the Protestant professors are not the Christian Church. Moreover, there are also a number of Protestant professors who faithfully hold to the Christian doctrine of justification by faith in the gospel without works of the law. Furthermore, besides these professors, there are also thousands of Protestant pastors in all countries who actually preach the Christian doctrine of justification, even though they are not considered by the world to be actual representatives of Protestantism. We have, like Pius XI, "some real hope" that, as a result of the publication of the Jubilee Bull of May 31, a number of lukewarm Protestants will return to the Christian doctrine of justification and from here take up anew the struggle against the so obviously antichristic papacy. (4) We should not fail to remember that all Christians throughout the world, including those Christians who still exist under the

3) Vol. VIII, 576.

The Apology of the Augsburg Confession rightly notes that despite the official papist doctrine of works. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession rightly remarks that in spite of the official papist doctrine of works, whereby Christ, the reconciler of men, is made a lawgiver and justifier from the works of the law, mansit tamen apud aliquos pios semper cognitio Christi. [4]) And Luther reports: "I have seen a monk who caught a cross in his hand and said, when the other monks praised all their works: 'I know of none of my merits but of the merit of him alone who died for me on the cross,' and he also died on it." 5) The Apology of the Augsburg Confession issues the following warning against the papacy: "Although the Antichrist will remain in part with his false worship until Christ the Lord comes in public and judges, all Christians should be warned to beware of such idolatry, and should learn how to serve God rightly and obtain forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ, so that they may honor God rightly and have constant comfort against sin. For therefore God has graciously made his gospel to shine, that we might be warned and saved." 6) We conclude for this time with some words of Luther, which he prefixed to his printing of the Jubilee Bull of Clement VII. Luther writes: "Dear Pope Clement, thou wilt not so support us as to buy more indulgences. Dear golden gate, dear bulls, go home again and again! . . . He that knows you, chews you not. We know, praise God, that every hour those who hear and believe the holy gospel have a year of rejoicing, as Luk 4:19 says, that the time when the gospel is purely approaching is the right, rich, pleasant year of rejoicing. We have no need of your bulls, dear Pope, nothing at all." 7) F. P.

Defense speech against the accusation of insulting an ecclesiastical institution.

Delivered before the criminal court in Karlsruhe by E. A. W. Krauß, Lutheran pastor in Baden.
(Conclusion.)

However, even in the event that the high court should not agree with this view, which I respect as the only correct one, I must apply for my acquittal, for the reason that the expressions I have used are completely justified according to the Lutheran confession, but the Lutheran confession is tolerated in Baden, which would cease to exist as soon as confessional expressions are used.

4) M. 151,271.
5) St. L. ed. VII, 1949 f.
6) M. 270, 98.
7) St. L. ed. XIX, 767 f.

would not be tolerated, but would be punished. Since the Peace of Westphalia, which not only confirmed the provisions of the Augsburg Religious Peace of 1555, but also extended them in favor of the Lutheran Church, no minister of the Lutheran Church can be punished for such statements, which are in accordance with the Lutheran confession. Until then, however, the Roman Church had claimed for itself the right to declare certain doctrines blasphemous and to impose anathemas upon them, as the Roman Curia still does; but in the Peace of Westphalia (V, 1), by uttering the sentence: Quod uni parti justum est, alteri quoque justum sit - What is right for one part is right for the other - one part of religion was made equal to the other in this respect also. What the Peace of Westphalia wanted to end was the struggle of the contending religious parties, to be sure, but the struggle with fire and sword, not the spiritual struggle with word and scripture. The latter would have been forbidden neither by the Lutherans, who in principle never wanted to know of any other way of fighting, nor by the Reformed, nor finally by the Romans. Now, even if the political provisions of the Peace of Westphalia can, for the most part, be thrown into the scrap heap, in view of the fact that the world has since acquired an entirely different face, this cannot be done with chapter 5, not with the religious part of these resolutions. On the contrary, not only have numerous Protestant and Catholic princes declared themselves guarantors of the Peace of Westphalia up to recent times, precisely with regard to this part of its provisions - Dr. Klüber has published a book of his own on this subject - but also all teachers of canon law - with the exception, of course, of the curialists Philipps and Dr. Jörg, who, however, do not make a summer of these two pious swallows - generally recognize the continuing validity of these provisions.

The permission to fight each other by word and writing, which was by no means abolished by the Peace of Westphalia, but rather confirmed, was used just as extensively after the Peace of Westphalia as it was before and during the Thirty Years' War, as is amply proved by the countless pamphlets that have been exchanged between the divided churches up to the present day. The constitutions of the German states of our century, too, have all permitted, partly directly, as in Bavaria, partly indirectly, by guaranteeing freedom of conscience and belief, that the symbolic books of the religious societies existing in them, recognized or tolerated, may be taught, preached, and, of course, testified to and polemicized in public print. So long as these constitutions are in force, the following may be permitted

No one, under the pretext that it is no longer in harmony with the spirit of the times, can prevent or suppress a polemic that is conducted with expressions that are found in the Holy Scriptures and in the symbolic books. This knowledge has also remained with a not inconsiderable part of our people. When, in 1870, Rome announced to the world its dogma of the infallibility of the pope, people were astonished at it as a blasphemy, and they had no decency to call this dogma of self-idolatry. Who, I now say with the Peace of Westphalia, Quod uni parti justum est, alteri quoque justum sit; the united church of Baden has no more claim to legal protection than the Roman. Must the latter put up with it, not only that dogma as blasphemy, but in ever-renewed editions of the symbolic books of our Lutheran Church, the Mass, regarded by Rome as its most sacred institution, as a "shamefully blasphemous, accursed fair" (Müller, p. 303, Schmalk. Art.), yes, as a "dragon's tail that has spawned many vermin and creatures and many an idolatry": she must put up with it, in ever new editions of D. Luther's Postillen, partly produced with princely-royal support, not intended for scholars, but for the general public. If Luther's postilions are reproached most severely, if their bulls, breviaries, and councils are attacked most ruthlessly, the publications and resolutions of a united general synod have no greater right to protection in a state of parity. Would it not be quite disgraceful for me to attack as a blasphemy a doctrine which has been called blasphemy in the symbolical books of my Church, when and because a Roman priest has pronounced it, but to keep silent when quite the same doctrine is delivered in all composure by a Protestant minister? Would not this be to apply double standards, which, according to the Scriptures, is an abomination to the Lord? And would it not be double standards if the secular court were to let such an attack go in the first case, but punish it in the second? By the way, the Baden Landeskirche itself does not consider the decisions of its General Synod to be untouchable and irreformable, and when Pastor Specht of Jspringen once (in the year '67) thought they were, because it was the Synod of the year '55, the opposite was very vividly testified to him by the elderly Prelate Holzmann and some other Synod members; that is why a General Synod is held every five years, so that one can improve what one has done in the previous ones. As long as the State continues to print new editions of the vehement Roman condemnatory decrees on the one hand, and of the Lutheran symbols on the other - from which, as from Luther's writings, I have learned the doctrinal and martial methods I use - so long must he who crosses the boundary line of the religious basis tolerated by the State, and so long must he who does not cross the boundary line of the religious basis tolerated by the State.

or symbolic books would remain unchallenged and unpunished - unless a printed sheet containing the same accusations and charges would remain unpunished if the name of Luther were written in front of it, whereas it would be punishable if W. Krauß or someone else were named as the author on the title page. Thus the Protestant High Church Council, which loves to regard us Lutherans as a new sect, even though our confession is a few hundred years older than the Union, has no other than intellectual means at its disposal against statements such as those I have made, legally speaking, as it can convince itself from Spohn's State Church Law. But I am all the less afraid of this spiritual weapon of the High Church Council at this time, since he, convinced that it would not be very adequate and effective, found it necessary to resort to other means of help.

Now no jurist will be ashamed to say: "Yes, that in your symbolic books there are such salted and peppered expressions against the doctrines, institutions, and customs of other ecclesiastical communities, the State has just not known, otherwise it would have refused its permission from the beginning; or it has presupposed, when it permitted you to officiate, that you would not reproduce such expressions of your confession, that in these pieces at all you would not consider yourself bound by your confessional writings." The Confessions of our Church are not an old quarto or folio volume which stands only in the corner of a university or scholarly library, but are a popular book of the Protestant Church, intended for the people, and -even in recent times distributed in large numbers by the Protestant Book Foundation in Berlin, a Uniate institution- from which princes and states have long since been able to take and have taken thorough insight since 1530 and 1580; They are a book to which most German regional churches - or more correctly state churches - invariably commit their church servants before entrusting them with a teaching office. That in more recent times the fabric of these obligations has been made looser, so looser that, to speak with Döllinger, neither small nor large flies are any longer caught in it, I know well; but that injustice has thereby been done to the Christian congregations, I know also. As little as anyone will say that the public servant is bound by his oath to the law of the state only so far as he considers himself bound and obligated, so little can the preacher of a church community be granted the right to consider certain portions of his symbolic books which are not arbitrary to him and others as non-binding, and to treat them so. Therefore, as long as, as in the state churches calling themselves Lutheran, the state demands the oath on the symbolic books through its consistory officials, or as long as, as with us in Baden, it nevertheless fundamentally opposes the taking of such an oath on the part of the congregation, the state has the right to demand the oath on the part of the congregation.

If a church servant does not in principle put anything in the way, he is entitled to the assumption that he is permitted to publicly profess his tolerated or recognized confession. Now that our symbolic books have been in existence since 1580, we Lutherans certainly cannot be expected to consider even the expression of our confession to be punishable. We do not regard them as such, not a single one; and if the State does regard them as such, it must designate them by name and clearly, so that one knows where one stands and what one wants to decide. Before it does so, it is not § 166, but § 2 of the Imperial Penal Code which comes into play, according to which an act can be punished only if that punishment was determined by law before the act was committed. Section 166 itself is by no means such a legal provision; for anyone who wanted to use this section to suppress confessional statements would thereby have touched the freedom of faith and confession guaranteed in the German constitutional documents. Negotiations such as the present one, however, can at most suggest the idea of proposing that a provision be added to § 166 to the effect that expressions which have already been exempted and tolerated by recognition of the symbolic books should not, of course, be regarded as "insulting expressions" within the meaning of this paragraph.

Finally, there can be no objection to the polemics I have used, that they are too sharp and likely to cause discord. It is true that the expressions used are sharp, even very sharp, but they are biblical, and the Bible is also sharp, very sharp; it is not a blunt knife to be ridden upon, but the word of God, as it is said in the Bible, is living and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword. If one wished to forbid the use of the words "blasphemous, ungodly, unholy," and the application of the same where they are, as here, in the place and justified, one would have to forbid, by the same right or rather wrong, the ecclesiastical use of a whole host of expressions of which the prophets and apostles, nay, Christ, Love Himself, made use. But let this be far off! You all know that Christ and His apostles called false teachers by the following predicates: Thieves, robbers, murderers, wolves, ravening wolves, even occasionally viper-breeders - expressions which, though they sound injurious, were very justifiable. As little, then, gentlemen, is it made a crime for any one to speak in civil intercourse of a convicted thief as of a thief, of a murderer as of a murderer, so little can a servant of JEsu Christ, who gave the command not only to feed the sheep, but also to warn them against the wolves, allow himself to be deprived of the right to call him who is invented a spiritual thief, because he withholds from the church many pieces of wholesome doctrine, which he has given her with-

If we follow the example of Christ and His apostles in this, as is commanded in the Holy Scriptures, then the accusation of the people today, as it was 1800 years ago, is: "He hath heaten up the people, he hath heaten up the people, he hath heaten up the people, he hath heaten up the people, he hath heaten up the people, he hath heaten up the people, he hath heaten up the people, he hath heaten up the people. But if in this, even to a small extent, one follows the example of Christ and his apostles, as the Holy Scriptures enjoin, the accusation of the people to-day, as it was 1800 years ago, is, indeed, "He hath stirred up the people, he is a disturber of the peace;" then, indeed, as the prophet Amos once did, one gets to hear from the people, "Thou goest away, and flieth into another country, and eateth bread there, and prophesieth there, and prophesieth no more at Bethel; for it is the king's pen." But they that make this accusation know not what is the matter with the peace which our Lord Jesus came into the world to bring; know not that beside this peace there is a strife, which Jesus Himself described, not once only, but at the first, in the words, "Think not that I am come to send peace out of the earth, but a sword. For I am come to provoke a man against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the cord against her inlaws: and a man's enemies shall be his own household. But whosoever loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and whosoever loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." For although it is not those who take Christ as their example in the teaching and penal ministry who cause discord, yet as soon as the wholesome teaching of Christ finds believing confessors, the noise raised by the unbelievers against these confessors is always set at the expense of the right preachers, And in all the family quarrels which then arise between the believing and unbelieving members of the household, no one but "the accursed priest" is to blame, who has roused the people somewhat from their dream life or spiritual sleep. To such treatment every true disciple and servant of Christ must be seated, and not be surprised when his enemies, as Christ foretold, bring him before their council-houses. Who, in a State calling itself Christian, may expect of the aldermen with all firmness that they will not be carried away by the prevalence of the unproved cry, "If this man had not been a disturber of the peace, we would not have delivered him up to you!" but will let go where only the truth, though bitter to hear, has been borne witness to, and against this witness only a blind, unnecessary noise has been made. At least I know for certain that in the whole of Baden no human being, neither in body nor in soul, and a human being consists of both, has been harmed in any way by my funeral speech, neither by reading it nor by hearing it.

High Court! It is a verse of the Baden hymnal that has been attacked. In the Saxon regional church...

Lutheran, one has in many districts a similar one, which in quality does not pretend much to the Baden one, the Dresden hymnal, and this Dresden hymnal was titled in a writing published in 1878 by Mr. P. Ruhland in Planitz: "Der getroste Pilger aus dem Babel der sächsischen Landeskirche in die lutherische Freikirche," p. 142, thus attacked (the book is put in questions and answers): Question 333: What is to be said about this Dresden hymnal? "The same is a collection of nearly 900 songs, of which, however, only very few deserve the name of Lutheran hymns, but all the others are a partly obviously unchristian, even blasphemous chant of human merit and righteousness, partly yet an unspiritual, saltless, rationalistic drivel of virtue." Then, as proof, song verses are cited as samples, most of which are also found in the Baden hymnal. Question 336 then reads: Is this horrible hymnal still in use? Answer: "Unfortunately, in all Protestant churches in Dresden and in many provincial congregations." Against this testimony of Ruhland, which caused a great sensation in Saxony at that time, the Saxon consistory, which usually does not miss the opportunity to attack the testimonies of the Free Churches, did not see itself compelled to file a complaint with the public prosecutor. Perhaps it thought - and here I am putting the best conceivable thoughts to it - that it was enough that for half a century we had given the Christian evangelical people stones instead of bread; we do not want to add to this injustice by demanding that the stones should also be called bread and be taken for it. In this case, therefore, the accusation was not made.

However, I would like to draw the attention of the high court to another case in which a complaint was filed. In 1871 the Separate Lutheran pastor A. Hörger of Memmingen issued a pamphlet, entitled: "Divine Right and Duty to Form a Free Lutheran Congregation in Memmingen." In it he had called the Lutheran pastors of Memmingen "thieves, robbers, and false prophets"; in this writing he had called the Roman Church, in the words of Luther and in the sense of our symbolic books, a "murder pit of the Roman Antichrist," and characterized the oath which the Protestant pastors of Bavaria have to take on a summa of ordinances, some of them quite papist, as a "ghastly blasphemy." The consistory took up the cause of the Memmingen pastors and sued pastor Hörger for all these statements. Bor the jury court in Augsburg a catholic lawyer led the cause of the accused, and the latter himself proved in the course of the trial that he had used the predicates interpreted as insults with ecclesiastical law and in the sense of the symbols recognized by the state. The Ge-

The jury, the majority of whom were Catholics, pronounced the verdict of "not guilty" on the evidence presented, after which acquittal followed. Pastor Hörger later gave detailed information about this trial in a little book, "Freiheit des lutherischen Bekenntnisses" ("Freedom of the Lutheran Confession").

High Court! I, too, in view of the fact that I am 1. materially in the right, in that I have proved at length and clearly the correctness and Scripturality of the expressions I have used; in view of the fact that I am 2. also formally in the right, in that my statements are nothing other than the pronouncement and judgment of the confessions which I have invoked and which are tolerated by the State - I likewise expect with full confidence a "not guilty" and " acquittal " as the only possible verdict of your administration of justice. _____ _____

Miscellany.

A complaint from the previous century about the unfamiliarity with the Lutheran Confession. While arranging smaller writings, which refer to the condition of the church in the previous century, a writing "The unchanged, true Augsburg Confession, for the comrades of the Lutheran Church", fell into our hands. Neither the name of the author nor the year of printing is given. The manuscript is printed in the fifth edition at Heidelberg. From the "Introduction" we place the following here:

"Whoever wants to live in a city should know and keep the city law that he wants to enjoy,' says Luther in the preface to the Small Catechism; and to a much higher degree, everyone who wants to be a member of a church should know and keep the confession of the church, which he wants to confess and enjoy. For there it is only a matter of human right, here of divine truth; there only of temporal welfare of the body, but here of the eternal salvation of the soul. This is especially true of the confession of the Protestant Church, which it has expressed in the Augsburg Confession. The Augsburg Confession is a brief and concise summary of the entire doctrine of salvation, as it shines forth from the Word of God, which was recovered and reopened by the Reformation, and as it has been recognized and established. It is therefore the clear and faithful expression of all that the Protestant Church believes and teaches on the basis of the divine Word, and preserves and holds fast against all error and deviation. . . . How anxious, therefore, we should be to make ourselves rightly acquainted with the dear fundamental confession of our evangelical church and to take up its rich treasures of divine truth of salvation intimately! But this is precisely one of the chief infirmities of our present state of the church, that most of the members of the church in all the states of the world are not familiar with it.

who no longer know the confession of the same, and very many have not even seen it, let alone read it and taken it to heart. And what is more, they excuse and reassure themselves about this ignorance and indifference by pretending that we, as evangelical Christians, do not base our faith on a human confession, but on the Holy Scriptures themselves, and that we therefore have to adhere not to the confession, but to the Bible itself. But this is only a vain and deceptive pretence, which has no foundation in itself, and lulls us into a pernicious certainty about our own infirmity. For it is true that Holy Scripture is and remains the eternal source and ground of faith, but faith is not dumb, but speaks out its content, the truth of God recognized and apprehended from Scripture, in confession, and testifies and proclaims it therein against all untruth, error, and falsehood, as has been done from the beginning, first in the Apostolic, then in the Nicene, and finally in the Athanasian Creed. . . . Experience bears witness, to our great sorrow, to the dangers and disruptions to which ignorance of our ecclesiastical confession and indifference to it lead. For our evangelical church is not held together by the bond of an external church constitution or by external ceremonies, but faith and the confession of the pure doctrine of the gospel is its foundation and its common bond. As soon then as this faith and confession is neglected and unknown, all must go out of joint and fall into ruin. This we see. Few now know clearly and definitely what evangelical faith and doctrine are, and what God's treasures they have in them; most do not know how to distinguish what agrees with the word of God and what contradicts it. How weak and defenceless they are, therefore, when the tempter approaches and attacks them! And this happens more violently and manifoldly in our day than at any other time. On the one hand, unbelief is preached and spread in sermons under the most varied names and forms of rationalism, German Catholicism, the free Protestant Church, the friends of light, Christianity of the faithful, and the like, and unfortunately thousands become its unhappy prey, because they have never thoroughly learned the doctrine of the Protestant Church and have not armed themselves with it. And, on the other hand, the Roman Church never tires, notwithstanding its many pernicious and publicly refuted human doctrines, of still boasting of itself alone as the true and beatific one, of blaspheming the evangelical doctrine as a terrible heresy, and of trying by all means to make the members of the evangelical Church to believe in it, and many of them, unfortunately, succeed in this temptation, because they do not know the divine treasures of the evangelical confession and are not able to resist the cunning of seduction.

are fastened. This is where ignorance and indifference to our dear evangelical confession leads us. And since we have fallen into this state and are surrounded by such disruption from within and such dangers from without, is it not high time that we gave up the security we had dreamed of and thought with the greatest zeal about how the damage may be healed and the danger averted? The first thing, of course, is and remains that the Word of God should again be taught and practiced among us with renewed earnestness and zeal, loud and pure, in church, school, and home; But the second is that in all classes also the knowledge of the glorious confession of our Evangelical Church and the living consciousness of our fellowship and unity in it as the Church of Christ may again awaken, grow and increase, and that in it we may learn to feel the greatness of the happiness of being allowed to belong to that Church, which, free from human statutes and doctrines, is built only on the eternal rock of Christ and on the pure word of his Gospel, and which therefore, in unison with all believers of all centuries from the time of the Apostles onward, can and may enjoy the full enjoyment of his truth and salvation. For the more this knowledge and consciousness grows and increases among us, the more dear to us becomes the jewel of our Church, the more steadfastly and faithfully do we then hold fast to it, and the more vigorous and strong do we become to overcome and crush all temptations of error and falsehood that come upon us."

After the content of the 28 articles of the Augsburg Confession has been pointed out, it says at the end of the introduction: "In this form the confession was handed over at the Imperial Diet in Augsburg, in this form it has been regarded for three hundred years as the epitome of the doctrine of the Protestant Church, and on the basis of it it has been publicly recognized in many countries and kingdoms; in this form it is still now the banner under which we gather and fight against all cunning and power of lies and error. With great fidelity, from the beginning, the Church has held fast to the same as her great jewel, and has carefully watched not only over its contents, but even over the purity of its expressions and words. For when Melanchthon, in later editions for which he was responsible, expressed things differently and, in particular, significantly changed the 10th Article of the Lord's Supper in the edition of 1540, the Church resolutely rejected these changes and remained faithful to the pure, unadulterated text as it was contained in the copies handed over to Emperor Charles V and included in the public editions of the Confessions. It is therefore also called the unaltered, true Augsburg Confession, for clear distinction from the later, altered edition, and is also faithfully printed here in this edition. May God then also grant us grace that we may once again faithfully

Learn to hold to it as our fathers did, boldly and steadfastly confessing Christ according to its content, and tolerating no other doctrine in church, school, and home that is contrary to it. For it is founded on the word of God, and the word of God endures forever and makes wise to salvation all who believe in it. Thus, and thus alone, is the salvation of the church as a whole, and of its members individually, established. To this end, then, may this edition of the precious confession work and help, under the blessing of our God and Father in heaven, to whom be praise, honor, and glory through Jesus Christ our Lord, now and forever. Amen. " F.P.

About Benares, the holy city of the Indians, someone writes in a local political newspaper: "What Rome means to the Catholic and Mecca to the Mohammedan, that is Benares, the capital of the Indian district of the same name, to the Hindu. From all parts of the world, members of all races and castes of India, the rich, the old, the afflicted, the murderers, and the beggars, make pilgrimages to Benares. It has been calculated that during the pilgrimage season at least fifteen thousand people camp on the banks of the Ganges or bathe in its sacred waters. The two thousand temples and the seven thousand chapels of the city have, each separately, its congregation; for Benares is the centre of the worship of Shiva, and to this deity also most of the temples are dedicated. At the entrance crouch fakirs, who squat before the temples completely naked, and have their heads strewn with ashes. They sit with their legs crossed, their hands folded on their stomachs, and resemble stone images in their immobility. The number of wooden and stone idols that adorn the streets of Benares, writes Mario Appelius in the *Popolo d'Italia, is* legion. According to an English statistic, the number of images of saints is stated to be 500,000. According to the Hindus, however, their number exceeds twice that number. And this figure does not seem to be exaggerated when one makes a tour of Benares, where one encounters at every turn the idols of the deity and their obscene attributes, which, moreover, are available for sale in abundance in every shop. It seems that the whole city has no need of food; at least there is nothing edible to be seen in any shop, but all the more objects of worship, such as crowns, necklaces, sacred stones, amulets, vessels for ablutions, and above all, in the midst of the water from the Ganges and the Brahmaputra, the 'Linga', the attribute of the procreative deity. Everywhere one comes across objects that have been thrown away by the passing pilgrimage processions, and

there rotting in the shelter of the sacred cows and men. Naked are the men who return from washing in the stream; half-naked the women who descend to the Ganges, naked the throng of children like the priests and fakirs. This naked humanity appears chaste in comparison with the disgusting obscenity of the

Statues and pictures. The emblems of this frighteningly brutal religious verism are everywhere on display. They are in the hands of the children, dangling from the necks of the women and from the belts of the men. And in the midst of this throng of men, the sacred cattle from the temple stride quietly and comfortably along. In the streets stand the camels and horses of the caravans with their loads piled high. Cries and prayers are heard everywhere. Men writhe in epileptic convulsions, madmen gesticulate, the howls of the sick and the loud voices of the preachers are mingled with their cries. All Benares seems a witch's cauldron into which drunkenness casts boiling bubbles. And as if the din on earth were not enough, ravens and vultures caw and scream in delight. They, too, seem infected by the general madness. Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, the holy places, pale into insignificant insubstantiality compared with the scenes that unfold in Benares, where religious ecstasy rises to obsession. Five o'clock in the evening on the Ganges. The sun is sinking on the horizon, reflecting its fiery gold in the water. The streets leading to the stream are filled with people thronging to the bath, flowers everywhere and prayers. Shrieks of monkeys, cries of parrots, caws of vultures, beats of gongs, sounds of bells, temple music, fanfare sounds of processions mingle with the chanting and shouting of the crowd to the orgy of a witches' sabbath. Slowly the great barque of Shiva, the "Badegia', with the colossal statue of the god under a canopy of yellow silk, glides into the middle of the river. On the forepart stands a white-robed Brahmin with uplifted arms, shouting down the 970 names of the deity. From the water, from the streets, from the balconies, the thousand-headed crowd answers with the wild cry: 'Kailas, Kailas!' For a distance of three kilometres the two banks descend in a granite staircase, covered with the brightly coloured screens under which the priests of Brahma perform their idolatry. Bizarre architecture representing ancient styles builds up on the heights of the riverside streets. The richest and most powerful maharajas of India take pride in building magnificent mansions on this spot. It is a bewildering jumble of pavilions, domes, verandas, bell towers, pyramids, obelisks, pagodas and sacrificial altars. Other temples and kiosks are built on piles or stones in the water, painted with gaudy colours, and profusely adorned with carpets, fabrics, and oriflambs. Some of these buildings, like those of the Rajah of Nepal, of Indore, and of Newah, are veritable palaces, rising from the water like islands of marble. Huge walls, remains of ancient Cyclopean edifices, stretch their mighty arms forward into the river; other walls, no less ancient, are half submerged in the mud of the river, and are slowly dissolving. Three millennia have left a chaos of stones there.

and marble are heaped up, and no one dares touch one of these stones or move a pole. For every stone is sacred, and the ruined buildings are strengthened as best they can by new material and are kept in a makeshift state. Thus the river carries in its bed the debris of millennia. More than three thousand people populate this amphitheatre at this moment. The setting sun brightly illuminates the spectacle of human folly. The gaze wanders from the yellow water to the women who bathe there, from the towers where the saints rest, from the fakirs emaciated to skeletons to the lepers who roll at the feet of the holy images, from the Brahmins who draw Shiva's obscene mark on the foreheads of the faithful, to the sacred cows majestically descending the steps to the river, from the monkeys playing their mad game on towers and walls, to the penitents flagellating themselves, and the bayaderes selling their bodies for the bill of Vishnu." As we read the foregoing, we were reminded of a picture that came before us years ago. The picture depicted a vast mass of people rushing toward the flood waters of the Ganges. The caption reminded us of Isa. 9:3: "Thou makest the heathen much; therewith thou makest not many of the pleasures." Poor heathen people whipped up to madness by the devil! F. P.

Literature.

Published **by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo**:

1. American calendar for German Lutherans for the year 1925. price: 15 Cts.

2. Lutheran Annual 1925. Price, 15 cts.

These old friends are back again, having been provided with everything necessary by P. E. Eckhardt. Instead of the astronomical remarks printed earlier, the German edition contains a reference to a Scripture lesson for each day, the English one a short Bible verse.

3. **Synodical report of the Atlantic District of** the Missouri Synod. 1924. price: 29 Cts.

The paper, delivered by Fr. O. Hanser, deals with the subject: "How does the faith of the children of God operate in their lives?"

4. Synodical Report of the Manitoba and Saskatchewan District of the Missouri Synod. 1924. price: 15 Cts.

The subject of the doctrinal proceedings, presided over by Prof. J. T. Müller, was, "Why should we always persevere in the confession of our Evangelical Lutheran Church, and rather suffer all, even death, than fall away from it?"

A.

5. Proceedings of the Central District of the Missouri Synod. 1924. price: 25 Cts.

The paper delivered by Rev. P. L. Dannenfeldt deals with the subject, "The Doctrine of the Call to the Public Ministry of the Word and Some of Its Practical Features."

6. Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans. Translated by *Prof. W. H. T. Dau*, D. D. Price: 10 Cts.

An article that appeared in the November issue of the *Theological Monthly is* reprinted here. After brief introductory remarks, there is a summary of Luther's classic preface to Paul's main epistle, and then follows an excellent translation of this small but delicious treatise by Luther. May this famous preface continue to be a great blessing!

A.

Lutheran School Journal. (*School Journal*.) Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

There is a general conviction that we need the "Schulblatt". Since in the circles of the Synodal Conference the parochial school is cultivated as by no other Protestant church body, and since we as a Synod have also placed the preservation and cultivation of the parochial school on our program, it should not be difficult to prove that a newspaper dedicated to the interests of our parochial schools is not only entitled to exist, but is downright indispensable within our Synod. Well edited from the beginning, the "Schulblatt" is now especially interesting and valuable because the Board of Education publishes its so-called "News Service" (editor is its executive secretary, teacher A. C. Stellhorn) in this journal, by which the readers are kept informed of any school fights, progress of the school system in our midst, and the like. The price, unfortunately, must be increased because of the unkindness of circumstances; from January, 1925, the journal will cost $1.50 a year. But the number of pages is increased, and now and then illustrations will be brought.

A.

The Religious Education of the Child. Address delivered before the "Lutheran Open Forum," October 20, 1924, by Otto C. A. Boeder, Chicago, Ill. 1924.

This address is published by our dear brother Fr Böcler at the request of the "Forum". It deserves wide circulation, not because it proclaims new truths, but because it presents the old correct principles about the Christian education of children in a clear, lively and convincing way. That the author regards the Christian church school as the means of instructing our children in God's Word, and of forming their character according to it, is self-evident. A sentence illustrating the gripping style of Father Böcler may be quoted here: "If a child can be made to understand that c-a-t spells cat, that a river is not an ocean, that geography is the study of the earth as the habitation of man, that the dividend is not the multiplier, then that child must also be taught the eternal and saving verities of its Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and it must also be taught to lead a moral life according to His Word." May we take it as a good sign that the "Forum" itself, where the various branches of the Lutheran Church in America were represented, desired the printing of this lecture? - The tract may be obtained from the author at the address: 1501 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill. Price: single 5 cts, postage extra; 100 or more each 4 cts, postage extra.

A.

Minutes of the Sixty-Fifth Annual Convention held by the Augustana Synod in North America. 1924. Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.

The report on this year's proceedings of the Augustana Synod is now available. It is a voluminous document, comprising 292 pages, followed by about 150 pages of statistical material. Whoever wants to get an exact insight into the activities of this great Synod must not miss to read this report. The presidential report is interesting and important. That Archbishop Söderblom visited the Augustana Synod is stated, and incense is sprinkled on His Grace. It is not mentioned with a syllable that this man teaches fundamental errors, and belongs to the most radical minds of the present age, in so far as they still make claim of the Christian names. Some other points of general interest may be referred to by a few excerpts from the Presidential Report:

"The language used in the Sunday-school is mainly that of the land. The week-day school can hardly be said to exist. True enough, it is still found here and there and is conducted in English. Now and then you find a few that use Swedish. Sometimes the pastors do the teaching. At a number of places the question is asked whether it might be possible to introduce religious education in the public school where work of this sort is permitted by the laws of the state. A few of our pastors have already begun this work." (Here perhaps reference is made to the so-called Gary Plan.)

"Considerable has been done for foreign missions during the year. Our Synod at this time has a considerable number of missionaries in heathen lands. For the time being twenty-five ministers are in the field, five of whom are not members of our Synod. These, together with their wives, the deaconesses, teachers, doctors, and other workers, constitute a group of something like one hundred and twenty persons, all of whom are dependent upon us for their daily bread. There is every reason to believe that the work of the missionaries in India, China, Africa, and Porto Rico has been fruitful of much good both for time and eternity. Great numbers of people gather for the services and many, particularly in India and Africa, request to be baptized. We are sending out new missionaries every year, but in spite of this there is plenty of room for more."

"The Augustana Book Concern is passing through what is very much akin to a regeneration. The English has, of course, come in almost with a vengeance and made it very difficult to sell Swedish books. A few Swedish books have been disposed of, but not nearly as many as formerly. Take, for instance, the item of Bibles. Four and a half times as many English Bibles as Swedish were sold last year and six and a half times as many English Testaments as Swedish. The same condition obtains, perhaps, in reference to other books. English religious literature must be gotten, and it is not at all an easy matter to secure for our people good and popular Lutheran literature in the language of the land. But we have not done so badly after all, and the financial profits are as good as could well be expected."

"Prior to the war we had something like ninety students in the theological seminary; about thirty of these were ordained every year. At the present time there are only about sixty students in the seminary. We need thirty young and well-educated ministers every year. We could secure thirty candidates for ordination for the next meeting of Synod, possibly even more, but in this case we would be obliged to admit into the ministry quite a number who would lack the necessary education for the office. We are not inclined to do this."

"Our increase in recent years has not been what it ought to have been - only 19 per cent, during the last ten years." **A.**

News on the Characteristics of Luther. By Georg Buchwald. Leipzig. Published by Eduard Pfeiffer. 1924. price, paperback: m.1.20; hardback: m. 2.50.

This is not a book about Luther, but "Lutherworte, aus der handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Predigten und Vorlesungen zusammengestellt von Georg Buchwald", who has made a name for himself as a Luther researcher and connoisseur. From the interesting introduction of D. Buchwald's interesting introduction the following passage may find place here: "The last decades have brought many Luther treasures to light. Among these, the Rörerschen Nachschriftenbände of the Univerfitätsbücherei in Jena stand in first place in terms of importance and volume. Luther's friend, the Wittenberg deacon Rörer, transcribed all of Luther's sermons from Christmas 1522 until his death, as far as he was able to attend them; of others, especially those held outside Wittenberg, he knew how to procure copies from other listeners. He has also handed down numerous lectures to us in his transcript.

"We possess thick volumes of Luther's sermons. But only a relatively small part of them was printed by Luther himself.

Many of Luther's sermons, which appeared as single prints, were edited and printed due to a more or less skilled listener. Even a small part of the Kirchenpostille was written directly by Luther. The editors and publishers of the other church postilion, Stephan Roth and Kaspar Cruciger, either kept to existing single printings or gave new sermons on the basis of postscripts, even they added pieces which did not come from Luther at all. Georg Rörer, the editor of the Hauspostille, put together sermons on the basis of his postscripts from sermons or pieces of sermons that belong to different years. It is already clear from what has been said that all these sermons and collections of sermons are only able to give us a vague picture of Luther's real way of preaching. In particular, the editor has very often watered down Luther's pithy words, omitted or blurred the personal, which is especially important for us, unnecessarily broadened Luther's speech, here and there also completely misunderstood Luther.

"What has been said leads us to expect that these transcripts, of the sermons as well as of the lectures, contain many things that are of not inconsiderable importance for the characterization of Luther, as well as many core sayings in which Luther's heroic nature is reflected, and finally also numerous self-testimonies of Luther. Valuable new traits will thus emerge for the overall picture of the Reformer."

What now D. Buchwald offers here are short, gripping sayings of which he believes that they find Luther's ipsissima verba. He groups these words of Luther under the following headings: 1. 2. the way to God. 3. finding God in faith. 4. God and I. 5. The Life of the Christian in God. 6. The Church. 7. papacy. 8. Germany. 9. miscellaneous. In some of the groups again a number of subdivisions are found. Some samples will not be unwelcome. The section entitled: "Not by Reason!^ contains, among other things, the following sentences: "Gospel and Reason contend against each other. The wiser reason is, the more it resists the gospel. - Let climbing and groping go, and listen where God leads us with his word. - When they poke their heads through the sky, and" look around in the sky, they find no one; for Christ is in the manger and in the woman's womb; so they fall down again and break their necks. Here stand ye, Thomae and Philippe, lift up at the bottom, and not at the top!"

This new collection of tremendous, delicious Luther words is hereby warmly recommended.

A.

A. Deichertfche Verlagsbuchhandlung dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig, has sent us: "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift", 8th issue, containing an article by D. Bornhäuser-Marburg on "JEsus and His Coming", furthermore an article by Dr. Cordier-Elberfeld, titled: "Vom Aufbruch evangelischer Jugend," and "Agrippa und das Christentum, Art. 26, 28," by D. Nägelsbach. - "Theologie der Gegenwart," issue 8, offers D. G. GrützmacherS reviews of recent church-historical phenomena.

F. B.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

From the Synod. Our Concordia College in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, has been housed in rented rooms. Now a property of its own has been purchased for the institution. From the report of President D. Pfotenhauer we highlight the following details: "In our midst was also Fr. E. Eberhardt, who began his blessed work in Alberta thirty years ago and has seen Edmonton develop and blossom into a city of 60,000 inhabitants, which has the Parliament building and the University of Alberta in its midst. After serious consultation we agreed with the brethren on a nine acre plot of land.

piece, which is centrally and delightfully situated. It takes fifteen minutes to get to the heart of the city on the streetcar that runs past the property, and our churches there are within easy walking distance of the students. On the north the property is bordered by a large city park, while on the south it is bounded by Highlands Boulevard, which follows the course of the Saskatchewan river as it rushes youthfully from the mountains in the deep valley toward its distant goal, Hudson Bay, and beyond the river spreads before the eyes a magnificent, wide landscape. . . . The negotiations for the purchase of the land presented all sorts of difficulties, as the land was in different hands, and we also had to acquire title to the rich coal deposit under the property to protect it against undermining. The mayor and other city officials were most kindly accommodating to our representatives, so that everything was arranged and an incontestable title could be issued. The nine acres together with the coal yard and a good house were purchased for $13,700. The house is valued at $8,000. An architect has been employed, who is now drawing up the plans, so that next fall the asylum may be opened on the new place." "Although Canada has suffered much through the war, it is slowly recovering. Work is increasing and the mission is gaining in importance. And as far as our institution there is concerned, though it is far behind its sisters in the United States as far as the outward equipment in the rented rooms is concerned, there is no difference to be noticed as far as the teaching and the attitude of the pupils (in number 62) is concerned." - On the change that has occurred in the school cause in Western Canada, Father E. Eberhardt of Stony Plain, Alberta, reports, "How wonderfully and gloriously the Lord has brought out our school cause! Some years ago the fathers of our school children had been dragged into court, fined, and compelled to send their children to the public school. Our parochial school had to be closed. The enemy triumphed! We walked along bent over and sad. In our distress we cried out to the Lord. Our help was in him alone. And, behold, though men would make it evil, yet God would make it good, that he should do as it is now in the day. Instead of the former one school, we now have two; instead of one teacher, we now have two; instead of the former 38 children who attended our school, there are now over 80; instead of an authority hostile to our church school, we now have an authority friendly to us. Truly this has come from the Lord and is a miracle before our eyes! Praise the Lord, my soul, and what is within me, his holy name! Praise the LORD, O my soul, and forget not the good things which he hath done thee.' The right hand of the Lord is exalted, the right hand of the Lord is victorious. Thanks are also due to you dear fellow Christians who were with us in our distress and supported our good cause so vigorously with prayers and gifts! May the God of our fathers continue to be with us and our schools, the planting places of our communities. Let him make us know the value of our schools always and more and more, so that we may carry them always on a praying heart and spare no sacrifice necessary for the preservation and promotion of them!" - To counter the rumors as if our Lutheran congregations in Chicago had slackened in their fight against the lodges,

the Seventh Visitation Circuit of the Northern Illinois District also discussed the lodges at its meeting held on November 16. The report states, among other things: "The meeting unanimously passed the resolution: 'We declare anew that we approve and heartily embrace the decided stand of our Synod against the lodges.' " F. P.

II. Abroad.

In the Theological College of the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Saxony and other St. the following lectures will be given in the winter semester: Dogmatics (4 pc.) D. Mezger; Old Testament: Isaiah (2 pc.) D. Stallmann; Genesis (2 pc.) D. Stallmann; New Testament: Introduction (3 pc.) Prof. Kirsten; Galatians (2 pc.) Prof. Kirsten; Luke (2 pc.) Prof. Kirsten; Church History II (4 pc.) Rector Willkomm; Reading of the Augustana and Apology (2 pc.) Rector Willkomm; Pastoral (3 pc.) D. Mezger; Homiletical and Catechetical Exercises (3 pc.) D. Mezger; Encyclopedia (2 pc.) Rector Willkomm; Hermeneutics (2 pc.) Rector Willkomm; Hebrew and Greek Exercises for Beginners (3 pc.) Prof. Kirsten.

D. Walther reported in "Lehre und Wehre" (Jahrg. 27, 279 f.) from the "Pilgrim from Saxony" the following: "Through the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" it had become known in wide circles that the professors Wegscheider and Gesenius in Halle taught unbelief, and in addition in a frivolous manner. Immediately after this fact became known through the aforementioned newspaper, von Stein wrote a letter to Princess Wilhelm in which he commented on the matter as follows: "It is with the greatest indignation that one hears the insolence with which Professors Wegscheider and Gesenius misuse the lectern intended for the instruction of young divine scholars in order to reject the essential truths of the Christian religion. To such teachers a pious king, who justly removed one de Wette, entrusts the education of young divine scholars, who again spread their errors among the people, and to a weak-minded Altenstein, to a whole department of councillors attached to him, is one permitted a gross neglect of their duties? What is the use of endeavoring to bring uniformity into the worship of God by liturgies, when doctrines destructive of Christianity are unhesitatingly recited from the cathedra, undermined in the pulpits by pernicious words, or even communicated to the youth in catechism? If one wishes to perform the duties against religion and the Church to which one feels called by God, remove from cathedrals unchristian teachers, watch over the religious teachers of the people, or declare that the Church is left to itself as in the North American States, and then it is up to the members of the Church to see to the preservation of a purely evangelical doctrine.' Golden words indeed, which it would be wished were taken right to heart, not only by the liberals, but also by the church governments." Walther adds, "If these are really-and we agree with the "Pilgrim" in this-'golden words worthy of heeding,' why does not the "Pilgrim" himself take them to heart and stand up for them? " F. P.

A debate on Luther's Catechism at a meeting of the Lutheran School Association in Hermannsburg (October 1924) is reported in the "Deutsche Lehrerzeitung". The main lecture, it writes, was given by Rector Dannehl, Hamburg, on: "Why can't and won't we let Luther's Small Catechism be taken away from us in our Lutheran schools?" The lecture is to be printed, but some of it is already given here. "The Catechism," it was explained, "is not a textbook, but a book of life. It is not a compilation of dogmatic sentences, but a living organism. A catechism, therefore, cannot be made; it is born. It is incomprehensible how one can claim that the catechism is too abstract. In it everything is really alive, for nothing is more real, more real, than sin and grace, and sin and grace are what the Catechism is about. And further, there is hardly a book of which it is true as of the Catechism: Tua res agitur! Your cause is acted upon. And so, to sum up!) it could be said: The Catechism is the confessional presentation of the Gospel that has come to personal life. After very fine remarks had been made about the relationship of the Catechism to the Bible, to Biblical History, and after excellent methodical indications had been given, the speaker concluded his remarks with the words: "We cannot and will not let the Catechism be taken away from us."' The following resolution was adopted: 1. "In the conviction that our Lutheran State Church can remain a Lutheran Church only if Luther's Small Catechism is preserved for our church people as an expression of the content of faith, the Lutheran State School Association declared that this can be achieved only if our youth receive religious instruction based on Luther's Catechism. We therefore call upon all members of our church to elect only such representatives in the forthcoming elections to the State Church Convention who offer the guarantee that they will stand with full determination for the preservation of the Small Catechism in higher schools and in elementary schools." The Lutheran Regional School Association for Hanover has taken note with the most painful regret of the appointment by the Minister of Education of Prof. D. Schuster as lecturer in religious education at the University of Göttingen. Since Mr. Schuster has publicly declared, for example, that he absolutely rejects the sacrificial death of Jesus (see Der Krieg und die christliche deutsche Kultur 1915, p. 36), i.e., the foundation of all Christianity, he is certainly not suited to present Christian religious education to young theologians and prospective senior teachers. We therefore raise the most decided objection to the appointment, since our Lutheran people in Hanover can rightly demand that the pastors and the teachers of its youth themselves stand in the confession of the Lutheran Church." - So far the "Deutsche Lehrerzeitung". What has been communicated is an excellent discussion of Luther's catechism. Only it must be remembered that "textbook" and "book of life" as well as "compilation of dogmatic sentences" and "living organism" are not opposites, but rather demand each other. F. P.

on the activity of the Methodists in Germany and Europe in general, Dr. Otto Melle, Director of the Methodist Seminary at Frankfurt a. M., spoke at the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Methodist-

The Apologist's report states: "If I said above that not every jubilee represents a turning point in history, this remark does not apply to our jubilee. We are indeed, as in the history of Germany, so in the development of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at a turning point of vital importance. The outcome of the war, the collapse of the German Empire, the separation of the Church from the State, the currents in the labor movement and in the youth, have produced upheavals in the political and economic, as well as in the spiritual life of the people, such as seldom occur. The foundations of the whole culture have been shaken. That on which men were building has collapsed. Like drowning men, they cry out for a lifeboat, for a savior. I can only compare our time with that period when the culture of classical antiquity sank and the longing for something new went through mankind, or with the days before the Reformation. Such times pose special tasks for the Church of JESUS Christ. Do we Methodists in Germany and the other countries feel the great responsibility that rests upon us? When salt becomes dull, with what shall we salt? Do we have the power to salt? Can the Lord use us to be His witnesses today? Or do we rest idly on the laurels of the past? Are we absorbed in outward operations without the inward strength? Can we, by word and example, show Christ to those around us as the only, the complete Saviour? Are we men - and women - full of faith and full of strength? O I wish that all my brethren would realize their responsibility and see the great opportunities before us! It is not a question of Methodism; it is a question of God's kingdom. Methodism is not the end, it is only a means to an end. The end is: 'Thy kingdom come.' If all our members in Germany - and in the other countries - were sanctified people filled with the power of the Holy Spirit, what could happen! - If we thus examine ourselves before the Lord, and if there is a sincere repentance and a renewed, complete surrender to Him, the Jubilee could become the starting point of a glorious revival. It was our prayer to God from the beginning that He would bless it. It is an uplifting thought that hundreds of thousands of our brothers and sisters not only in Germany, but also in Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, the Baltic States, Russia, and America are occupied with the same things during these weeks. The jubilee thought reaches every member, every friend of our work, every youth ally, every child in our Sunday schools. All are putting the same questions before themselves for self-examination. All pray for the same gifts during the week of prayer. May we not rely on the promise of Jesus: 'Where two become one in asking, it shall be given them'? How if the Lord were to pour out the Spirit of prayer, the Spirit of love, and the Spirit of power upon them all in a renewed manner? If there were a thoroughgoing revival in all parts of the work? I know what is said here and there: we have become so poor; we lack churches, we lack means. Brethren, my heart sometimes aches when I see small faith among disciples of Jesus. Was Jesus rich? Was he not the poorest of the poor? Did the first Christians and the

Apostles the wealth of the world at their disposal? They were poorer than we are. But they had received the Spirit from above, which made them witnesses of the Crucified and Risen One; they had a heart full of burning love for lost souls; they had the strength to still rejoice in suffering, to be thankful, and to offer sacrifices; they had a burning zeal for the Lord, which made them, inflamed by him, fires of fire, kindling the fire of revival wherever they went; they had, in communion with Christ and in the consciousness of their calling, the faith that overcomes the world. Therefore the power of God worked through them, therefore they could be a salt of the earth, a light of the world. Through such a revival all problems would be solved at once, even the financial ones, and from the Jubilee a stream of blessing would flow into our congregations, into other churches and communities, into our people, into other nations, into the world." - To the foregoing we add what the same "Apologist" reports about the activity of the Methodists especially in Saxony: "The District Singers' Festival of the Christian Singers' Union on Sunday, August 24, in Zwickau turned out to be a mighty rally. Under the careful direction of the district conductor, Brother Gerisch, Zwickau, everything was well prepared, and the festival proceeded without any significant disturbance. It was an uplifting sight when, led by the trombone choirs from Wersau, Wilkau and Planitz, more than 600 singers strode through the city to Zwickau's 'New World'. After the devotion, led by Brother Lindner, Reinsdorf, there was a main rehearsal and then a performance of some songs and pieces of music on the main market square. Thousands of people surrounded the large square, which the police had cordoned off for the singers and on which they kept exemplary order, so that even the lively traffic was not interrupted for a moment. What a turn of events by God's providence!" we had to say again and again. About forty-five years ago, and much later, the municipal authorities of Zwickau believed they had to forbid us any activity, and now this tremendous Methodist demonstration, to which they offered the hand through their organs. This was done by the Lord, and it is a miracle before our eyes. To Him be thanksgiving and worship! In the afternoon at three o'clock was the climax of the day, when well over 3000 people filled the large hall of the "New World" and listened to the lovely melodies of the music and the songs as well as the address of the writer. But how glorious that the Gospel of Christ JEsu, which we were allowed to proclaim in song and word, is the panacea for every harm to the souls of the children of men! And how thankful we should be that our God has given us the world full of lost sinners as a field of work on which we may work with all our strength! May God also give us much grace and knowledge to use all the gifts and powers in the congregations and associations in the right way, so that no pound entrusted to us may lie idle!" For the congregations of the Lutheran Free Church in Saxony and elsewhere, there is hardly any temptation to Methodism, because they are all founded on Lutheran doctrine. On the other hand, the regional church pastors of Saxony, in so far as they have absorbed the modern Lutheran university theology, are no match for the Methodist pastors. The German Methodist pastors generally profess the inspiration of Scripture and the vicarious

Satisfaction of Christ. This, however, is not the case with the pastors of the national churches, provided they remain faithful to their theological training. They are therefore also unable to expose the soul-dangerous workaholism which is inherent even in well-meaning Methodism. F. P.

One of the sins of omission at the time of the Lutheran revival in Alsace. We read in the "Alsatian Lutheran," the organ of our brothers in faith in Alsace: "Even more ruinous for Lutheran revival [in Alsace] [than the failure to educate the "protest congregations" into free-church congregations, after protesting had gone unheeded] was the sad fact that the Christian people were again taught to pray: But from those who teach differently than the Word of God teaches, protect us, dear heavenly Father," but did not themselves live according to this truth. When the fathers of our Synod founded their church, they stood with their little congregations in the wilderness and in a poverty unknown here. The country, however, had plenty of universities for the training of future ministers of the word, which were certainly not at the low ebb of paganism like those at Strasbourg. But our fathers said: "If, according to Christ's command, we are to flee the false teachers as ravening wolves in sheep's clothing, we must certainly not entrust our sons to them for training in the ministry. Therefore they built themselves a log house in the wilderness and called it a Lutheran seminary. God has so blessed this act of faith that this log cabin has now grown into a seminary for preachers, which, after the completion of the new building that has been started, can accommodate about 800 Lutheran students and is surrounded by a ring of high schools, where about 2000 boys are being trained as Lutheran students and teachers. This sense of duty, that the orthodox church may not send its sons to unbelieving universities for training for the pastorate, but must make every sacrifice to train its future pastors in the faith of the fathers, was lacking in the revival period [in Alsace]. In this matter I put the question to a country church pastor: How is it? The protest congregations have virtually urged the founding of a seminary for the training of genuine Lutheran pastors. Those pioneers themselves had to experience in their own souls how damaging the course of studies at an unbelieving university was for their own persons as well as for the future of the church. Why did they neglect this so important work, for which we pray in the common prayer of the Church: "Bless the orthodox schools of learning for the equipping of faithful labourers in thy vineyard!" and entrust their own children for training to such as they so vehemently opposed as false prophets and ravening wolves in sheep's clothing, and in regard to whom they preached to the Christian people that they must be fled? The answer was, In this the blessed Horning was directly short-sighted. He proceeded from the proposition, 'I have worked my way by the hand of the aged; let the young do likewise.' By the God-trying argument, which may be heard advocated again to-day by the "Messenger of Peace," that God, according to His immeasurable mercy, plucked them as fires out of the fire, and brought them to the right knowledge of the Gospel, in spite of the soul-perishing labors in unbelieving universities, he-

When the Lord had brought the best sons of the church into the fire, they threw them into the fire in the false hope that they would be preserved in the temptation of God. How many a good farmer laments before the throne of God that he sent his faithful son there to serve the Lord in his vineyard, but there, instead of becoming a servant of Christ, he was deformed into a servant of Satan, as St. Paul calls the false-believing teachers. But what ruin has arisen for the Lutheran Church in this country from that sad position with the unbelieving university, we have had occasion to show before, and it is before every one's eyes today. But as before, so also here we must note that a right position in this question would have inevitably led to the Free Church even then. Genuine Lutheran pastors trained in a Lutheran seminary could not have found recognition in the state church. Free churches, however, were not wanted. The fear of this was the ultimate cause of the sad outcome of the Lutheran revival. The Free Church will soon have to be wanted. God grant that God's Word and the history of the revival will not speak in vain to those who still want a Lutheran Church! May laymen and pastors finally go to school in the Scriptures and learn what they have to say about the establishment of genuine Lutheran congregations and their organization! May all of them learn to recognize that the Lord of the Church does not ask for large numbers, but looks at whether we place His Word and His will above our prudent reason, and whether His Spirit is in us, who says: "Thy kingdom come! Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven!"' - We add, "The signs of a "Lutheran revival" are also present in the regional churches of Germany at the present time. We have repeatedly referred to this in "Lehre und Wehre." Also, statements have been made here and there to the effect that, in order to train truly Lutheran pastors, it will be necessary to establish theological schools of our own. Will this realization continue to break through and produce practical results? It would be most gratifying if the theological teachers at the regional church universities would return to the faith of the Church of the Reformation. But this could only happen under the most violent inner upheavals, because up to now Christian doctrine has been so generally opposed in its cardinal points, in the doctrine of the satisfactio vicaria and in the doctrine of the infallible divine authority of Holy Scripture. Of this inward convulsion, which ought to precede a conversion, little is unfortunately noticeable. It was some foreigners who, on occasion of the Convention at Eisenach, pointed out the necessity of revising the position on Scripture and vicarious satisfaction. This reminder, however, called forth essentially only general speeches to the effect that, in spite of existing differences, one was nevertheless united at the bottom of one's heart. After the Convention it was said, even from "positive" circles, "Non possumus," namely, to abandon the modern-theological position and return to the position of the old Lutheran Church. Thus the "Lutheran revival" in Germany, if it is not to come to nothing, will have to renounce the use of the Lutheran state universities for the training of its pastors and establish its own theological colleges. F. P.

The Chaos in Doctrine at the First Council of the Czechoslovak Church. In the "A. E. L. K." we read: "The "Deutsche Ev. Korresp.', No. 35, brings a report on the first council of the Czechoslovak Church, which came into being five years ago, at the end of August, in Smichow. According to the 'Märkische Volkszeitung', No. 262, 129 congregations were represented by 308 deputies, among them 100 clergymen. Bohemia provided 243 representatives, i.e. the majority. The chairman was the former Roman priest Farsky, who received the title of Patriarch. The Council was also attended by representatives of the Protestants, the Bohemian Brethren, the Methodists, the "Free Brotherhood' and the Czech Orthodox. The main purpose of the council was to compile a confession of faith. The Olomouc professor Spisar developed guidelines for this. According to these, tradition is not obligatory, but it is not rejected either, since it serves to understand the development of Christianity. The dogmatic authority of the seven first councils is not recognized. The source of the doctrine of faith is the Bible, but in the spirit of Christ, not according to the letter of the Gospels, which are the work of the apostles and only inaccurately reflect the teachings of Jesus. Of the Gospels only the first three are accepted as authoritative, but not the fourth. The Bible must be explained scientifically according to the spirit and tradition of Hus. Freedom of conscience is the foundation of faith, and faith is a gift of God's grace revealed in each individual. The Church protects the freedom of conscience even of minorities who dissent from the opinions of the majority. Purgatory, the resurrection of the flesh and other "unscientific' opinions are rejected. The Trinity and the personal God, distinct from the world, are recognized. JEsus is not God, but a man who mysteriously represents God's activity. There is no vicarious satisfaction. Openly one declared against episcopal authority, so that the church has a presbyterial constitution. A proposal was made from one side to abolish the ordination of clergy as well. If the Czechoslovak Church has really accepted the above 'confession,' it has cut itself off from the ranks of the Church of Christ." So much for the "A. E. L. K." But the same "confession of faith" could easily be compiled from the literary products of modern German theology, and without being confined to the liberal wing.

F. P.

Conflicting Reports on Russia. The "Church Bulletin" of the Iowa Synod reports from Dr. Morehead's communications on Russia how the Lutheran Church has arranged itself under the Soviet regiment. According to this, the Soviet government is not taking a hostile, but an accommodating position against the reorganization of the Lutheran Church. It says: "The Lutheran Church of Russia has at last received an all-embracing organization, the first since its existence. The number of adherents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Russia before the Revolution was estimated at 4,000,000 with 545 parishes, 770 churches, a large number of prayer houses, and 560 pastors. These Lutherans have now obtained a church constitution of their own, and have formed a union according to their own wishes. From the 21st to the 26th of June, the first convention of the general synod of the evan-

Lutheran Church of Russia - an event without comparison in the history of the church. It was the first time since the existence of Lutheran congregations in Russia that ecclesiastical and secular representatives from all parts of the country had been granted the privilege of assembling for deliberation and legislation. The Soviet Government had obligingly given permission for the Synod to be convened, so that the Lutherans could now assemble to regulate their own affairs according to their principles. Already in January of this year the preparatory work had been seriously undertaken. In January of this year the two General Superintendents, ten Presidents of District Synods, and clergymen from various parts of Russia met in Moscow to draw up a program for the proposed Convention of the General Synod. In this preliminary meeting a draft of a constitution was prepared. Pre-synodal meetings to discuss the proposed constitution and elect delegates were held in the various districts. A local committee was appointed in Moscow to make the necessary arrangements for holding the first convention of the Lutheran General Synod of Russia. Thus the great gathering was well prepared. The roll call of the districts showed that 56 delegates, 27 clerical and 29 secular, were present from 27 synodical districts extending from Vladivostok and Leningrad in the north to Odessa and the Crimea in the south. The General Synod has at its head a High Church Council, which includes two clerical and two secular members, plus a fifth, representing the non-German synods. The General Superintendents A. Malmgren and Th. Meyer, with the conferring of the title of bishops for life, were elected to the High Church Council. The two bishops will share in the work of administering the church and supervising the vast territories of Russia. The seat of the High Council of the Church will be Moscow. The bishops were appointed during the meeting of the Convention, by the three oldest clergymen: the provosts Hörschelmann, Althausen and Bonwetsch. Thus the Lutheran Church of Russia now has its ecclesiastical regiment and its ecclesiastical order, though the details are far from being all settled. The Lutheran Church in Russia has become a free church and can now develop according to its own principles. This is a great step forward in comparison with earlier conditions. If this church now succeeds in establishing a proper seminary for preachers and in training capable preachers for its congregations, and in developing a labor of love, especially in the field of native missions, then it will also spread and become a blessing to many. Dr. Morehead, who reported on this great event through the Publicity Bureau of the N. L. C., and from whose report we have given the above, concludes his report with the words: 'The Lutherans of Rutzland have won a great victory over historical traditions and unprecedented conditions now prevailing, by developing their church organization and plans from the principles of the gospel for the service of the gospel. The Lutherans of Russia have set an example for their more timid brethren in the Western world. We commend them to God and to the word of His grace.'" F. P.